

4th November 1935]

III.—A * BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS CITY MUNICIPAL ACT, 1919,
FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES (BILL No. 11 OF 1934).

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Hon. Members might remember that clauses 3, 4, 5, 6, 25, 28 and 46 of the City Municipal Bill were postponed. We shall now take up the postponed clauses first and after finishing them, we shall go to the other clauses. 11-15 a.m."

"Clause 3, sub-clause (v) is for the consideration of the House."

Clause 3.

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I move—

'In sub-clause (v) in the definition of "company," omit the words "and includes any co-operative society registered or deemed to be registered under any law for the time being in force in British India or any part thereof".'

"The reason for my moving this amendment is that everywhere co-operative societies and banks are at present enjoying some privileges as they are primarily intended for the benefit of the poorer classes of the population. As a matter of fact even in respect of registration charges, the Government have relaxed their rule in favour of co-operative societies by giving them some concession. I do not know why this provision has been inserted, while it did not find a place in the previous Bill. As co-operative banks should be treated on a separate basis, I feel that this portion should be omitted from the clause, if the provisions of this clause are really going to be for the benefit of the poor people. For these reasons I move my amendment."

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, in seconding this amendment, I wish to say that co-operative societies cannot be considered as companies at all. If you consider how the co-operative societies determine their profit and loss for the year, what they take into account is the actual realizations. Apart from that, according to the co-operative law, a fourth of the profits should always be set apart as reserve fund and that can under no circumstances be spent for any other purpose without the sanction of the Registrar, and most of the societies which have created this reserve fund have been adding to that fund year by year, but they have not spent any amount out of this fund for their purposes. Further, Sir, before the Retrenchment Committee came into existence, the co-operative societies were enjoying many benefits, but on account of the recommendations of that Committee, many of such privileges have been cut out. Prior to that the co-operative societies need not spend anything for registration of documents but now they have been charged half rates. Moreover, the object of a co-operative society is to encourage thrift among its members who are mostly persons belonging to the masses. Considering all these things, a co-operative society cannot be termed a 'company.'

* This Bill was discussed in part at the previous meeting till 9th August 1935.

[Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai] [4th November 1935]

"Then, Sir, the result of this provision in the Bill will be that the panchayatdars who are almost all of them honorary, will be put to great inconvenience. They have to furnish statements to the Corporation, municipalities and the district boards, as regards their profits every half year. As the co-operative societies are generally run by non-official agencies it is not at all times possible to furnish the statements at the required time and also with the amount of accuracy that is required by these local bodies. I therefore entirely agree with my hon. Friend, Mr. Krishnayya Choudari, that the deletion of these words from the clause will be a great benefit to the poorer classes of the people who resort to these co-operative societies."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, the hon. Member in moving his amendment has not evidently referred to the other provisions in the Bill which definitely lay down that registered co-operative societies which have a paid-up capital of less than Rs. 50,000 are exempted; and then on the recommendation of the Commissioner it is open to the Corporation to exempt any society from this tax. It has been found that there are various societies in Madras which although they have a nominal capital, are making large profits. It is therefore considered necessary and desirable that they should not be exempted altogether from the operation of this section, but if small societies should be exempted, that is, those with a paid-up capital of Rs. 50,000 and less, power has been given to the Corporation to exempt any society which in their opinion deserves such assistance. I think that that is sufficient. I therefore have to oppose this amendment and I submit that the provision in the Select Committee Report may be accepted by this House."

The amendment was put and lost.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

Clause 4.

Section 5 (i).

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Discussion will continue on amendment No. 2 in the printed list, namely:—

'In sub-section (1) (a), add the following words at the end:—

"and one specially reserved for Anglo-Indians, the Adi-Dravida, Labour and Anglo-Indian seats to be filled by election through joint electorate".'

"Mrs. Lakshmipathi moved the amendment and it was duly seconded on the previous occasion."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, last time when this question was under discussion, a motion for postponing the consideration of this clause was moved and so the discussion on this has not been completed. In this connexion I should like to say a few words explaining the attitude of the Government on this question. As the

4th November 1935] [The Raja of Bobbili]

Act stands at present, there is no reservation of seats for any community. At the time the Bill was originally introduced, Government left the matter open to the decision of the Select Committee and the Council. In the Select Committee, we devoted a considerable amount of time to find out an agreed solution of this most difficult question. I believe, what is found in the Report of the Select Committee has the largest amount of support; and generally in the matter of reservation of seats and representation of special interests and communities, Government have been more or less guided by the wishes of the minorities concerned. I would therefore appeal to hon. Members of this House that in a matter like this, if they want to respect the wishes of the minorities who are sought to be represented, they have to put forward agreed proposals which in the opinion of those minorities are the best to safeguard their interests and to give them proper representation. I therefore find myself in a position in which I am compelled to oppose the present amendment."

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Mr. President, after hearing the Hon. the Minister I am constrained to say that the Hon. the Chief Minister does not evidently seem to have understood the implications of the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mrs. Rukmani Lakshmipathi. The amendment says that one extra seat should be provided and that it should be allotted to the Anglo-Indian community. As regards that suggestion, the Hon. the Chief Minister has not made any reply at all. As regards the second suggestion contained in the amendment, namely, that election to these seats should be by means of joint electorates, the Hon. the Chief Minister said that the wishes of the communities concerned ought to be respected. I am not going to dispute that proposition. But as far as I am aware, I do not think either the members of the Adi-Dravida community or the members of the Labour Unions have objected to a system of joint electorates which is suggested in the amendment. At any rate, as far as the members of the Adi-Dravida community are concerned, I can say with a certain amount of confidence that they welcome the proposal contained in the amendment, namely, election to the reserved seats should be from the general electorate. Even for elections to the legislative bodies, it has been agreed that they should be on the basis of the joint electorate, namely, that all communities should vote together in one election returning a member reserved for that community in the general constituency. I think there is no point in opposing this amendment and I therefore appeal that my hon. friend's amendment be accepted."

11-30
a.m.

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I wish to correct the hon. Member. The Act provides for one seat for Anglo-Indians to be returned by the Anglo-Indian Association. Of course the amendment under discussion provides for joint electorate, the councillor, I presume being elected generally by the Anglo-Indian, Adi-Dravida and Labour electorate."

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" Mr. President, the present practice obtaining in the districts whereby the representatives

[Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai] [4th November 1935]

of the depressed and scheduled classes are returned by the joint electorates appears to be favourable. Therefore, I submit similar procedure may also be adopted in the Corporation."

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Mr. President, I am surprised that with the experience of joint electorates in the district boards and municipalities, my hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Pillai, should voice his approval of joint electorates. I claim to have intimate contact with the depressed classes and I am confident that there is not a single group among them who, after having seen the working of the joint electorate, are in favour of it. They have condemned it and if possible they would like to alter the arrangements proposed by the Government of India Act also.

"I do not know what the hon. Member, the mover of this amendment, means by a joint electorate for Labour. Are Labour seats to be thrown open to the voters of all classes and the candidature open to non-workers as well? I fail to understand what character the representative elected from such a constituency will have and how he will be different from any other candidate to be elected by the ordinary general constituency.

"I beg to refer once more to the joint electorate sought to be imposed on the depressed classes. Hon. Members will not be doing a service to these unfortunate classes but will positively be inflicting a hardship upon them. Depressed class members of the district boards and municipalities do not even dare to visit their colleagues' houses. That is the sad fate. I do not understand the necessity for joint electorate when it has been condemned by the members of the community and by all unbiassed and fair minded persons."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, I have been told that the system of joint electorate for Adi-Dravidas and Caste Hindus has been working on the whole satisfactorily in district boards and municipalities and recently in the elections which have just now been completed, I understand that an Adi-Dravida has been returned to the general seat, and of course to the reserved seat also. In any case, we have before us, the great attempt of Mahatma Gandhi to keep the Adi-Dravidas and the Hindus not merely in the same fold, but to introduce electoral and other conditions by which the solidarity of the Hindu community would perhaps be gradually promoted; and anything which seeks to undo that great work achieved at Poona seems to me to be conceived in an anti-nationalist spirit. It may be that there are people who take pride in the fact that they can undo on the banks of the Cooum what greater men have been trying to achieve elsewhere. Even granting that there are certain disadvantages, it would, on the whole, have been better if Madras had fallen in line with the general and nobler impulses of the country to promote the solidarity of the Indian people and Indian nationalism. As regards how the representation of Labour, or for the matter of that, Adi-Dravidas could be secured in its distinctive fashion by means of the joint electorate, the

4th November 1935] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

hon. Member seems to forget the expedient adopted in the Poona Pact. Joint electorate is not intended to secure the return of a colourless labourite or an Adi-Dravida who is merely an Adi-Dravida. In fact the logic of it requires that the election should be in two stages, the primary election by the labourites themselves and the final election in the joint electorate by which one or more of those candidates would be finally chosen."

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"On a point of information, Mr. President, I would like to know whether the question of primary election is included in the hon. Member's amendment or is the member for Chittoor making a new suggestion or moving a further amendment."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"That is not a point of personal explanation at all. The hon. Member has no right to interrupt me for eliciting information nor do I consider myself to be an encyclopædia for giving information.

"All I can say is that the experience of primary elections is widespread. In America it is a permanent feature. Candidates of various political parties, the Democratic party and the Republicans, have to go through a form of primary election before candidates are chosen. It is nothing strange. It is nothing difficult. I, therefore, feel it would be a good thing if the Hon. the Chief Minister would agree to the further consideration of this measure and try to preserve all the good that has been secured under the Poona Pact and also extend the principle to the representation of Labour. I appeal to him not in a spirit of criticism but in the belief that he too would like to do his little bit to promote the solidarity of our people and as far as possible prevent all those fissiparous tendencies which have been the bane of our national life."

* Mrs. A. RUKMANI LAKSHMIPATHI:—"Mr. President, during the last session, in moving this amendment that two seats for Adi-Dravidas, two for Labour and one for Anglo-Indians be reserved in the general constituencies, through a system of joint electorate, I gave my reasons in support of the amendment. I have not got much to add to it now and to what my hon. Friend, Mr. C. R. Reddi, has said. I have only one thing to say and that is to appeal to the Anglo-Indians to join the Hindus, Adi-Dravidas and Labour in getting themselves elected through general constituencies. They are the children of the soil; they are Indians and they have therefore to throw in their lot with the people of this country. My hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Pillai, pointed out that this system of joint electorate has been working very well in the local boards and there has been no difficulty so far. The Local Boards Act was amended in 1930, according to which seats have been reserved for Muslims, Adi-Dravidas, Christians, Europeans and women. When the system of joint electorates is easily worked in the local boards I do not see any reason why the same principle should not be followed in the Madras Corporation. The Hon. the Chief Minister said that the minority communities are not in favour of it.

[Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi] [4th November 1935]

But I should like to ask the Hon. Minister whether there was any specific proposal from the Anglo-Indians rejecting the offer of a joint electorate. The Government have agreed to the principle of joint electorate when they gave their consent to the Poona Pact. The provision as it stands in the amended Bill, if carried through, will go against the very spirit of the Poona Pact."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"When I spoke on the amendment at the beginning, I never claimed to be speaking for the whole body of depressed classes. What I stated was that the representatives in the Select Committee and in the Council with whom I have discussed the matter, were in favour of separate electorates. It will be seen from a perusal of the Bill as introduced that the Government as such had no intention of violating the Poona Pact by separating the various communities by separate electorates. I realize the noble impulses of those who were responsible for the Poona Pact in bringing together various communities. It should be, I am sure, the natural desire of every Indian that every attempt should be made to bring together various communities. But one may sometimes differ in the methods to be adopted to bring about such a happy state of affairs and I am one of those who believe that the quickest way of achieving that end is not through imposing the wishes of the majority on the minorities but leaving the matter to the minorities themselves. I feel that they are the best judges of their interests. I am this morning handicapped by the fact that many of the members of this House representing the depressed classes are absent. If they are willing to accept the amendment now before the House, Government will not have the slightest objection in accepting it.

11-45
a.m.

"If it is necessary, although I hesitate to make the suggestion, my suggestion is this. This suggestion has been proposed from time to time. If it is the general desire of the House, I have no objection to postpone this provision till the evening so that the House, before coming to a decision, may have an opportunity of hearing the views of members of the depressed classes in this House."

Diwan Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—"The Hon. the Chief Minister has said that the members of the depressed classes may not have an opportunity of giving out their views. In that view the further consideration of this amendment may be taken up afterwards."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"We will just postpone it now; if we are ready we will take it up this evening."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I am thankful to the Raja Sahib for acceding to my desire for adjournment of this amendment. But this is a matter in which a certain amount of private confabulation is necessary. I do not think we will be able to take it up this evening; a more prolonged examination of the question is necessary in the interests of both the minorities and the national welfare."

4th November 1935]

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I was suggesting a short adjournment and in case we do not come to any adjustment the question may be taken up later on. Last time considerable criticism was made because the opinion of the Council has not been settled. Members are considerably handicapped in dealing with the remaining provisions of the Act. I do not want to give any further cause for complaint. By this postponement we are placing the members at a great disadvantage in proceeding with the further sections of the Bill. I may also state that we postponed the discussion of this important provision last time and that I expect those who have spoken on the motion for adjournment would take advantage of the intervening period of time to think over the matter and come together. I am sorry to say we have practically forgotten the matter. ('Hear, hear.') It has come up now again before the House. Certainly I have no objection to accede to the request of Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I take it that the further consideration of amendment No. 2 is postponed."

"Consequently amendments 3, 4 and 6 in the printed list have to be postponed until the amendments up to 11 are disposed of. Amendments 3, 4 and 6 fix the number of divisional councillors at more than 45. I shall therefore first of all dispose of amendments 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11."

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I move—

'In sub-section (1) (a), in line 3, for the word "three" substitute the word "four".'

"This amendment is to give increased representation to the depressed classes. Sir, I do not think any words of mine are necessary to commend this amendment to the acceptance of this House. The importance of the depressed classes has sufficiently been recognized by the House and by the country and especially after the challenge of Dr. Ambedkar, the importance of the depressed classes has reached the highest magnitude. I think, Sir, the time has come when the caste Hindus should make amends for the privileges and rights which they had so wrongfully and unjustly withheld from the depressed classes for generations. I beg to hope, Sir, there will be very little opposition to this amendment."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"I second it."

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"The next amendment I move is—

'In line 4 for the word "two" substitute the word "six".'

"Sir, this amendment is intended to give increased representation to labour. As recommended by the sub-committee labour gets only two seats. I beg to move that this be increased by four so as to make the total number six. Sir, if in the franchise qualifications subtenancy has been accepted by the Select Committee as a qualification entitling a person to the franchise I would not have asked even for

[Mr. C. Basu Dev]

[4th November 1935]

a single seat for the labourers. Under the present franchise arrangements, workers are studiously avoided. If sub-tenants are enfranchised I do not see how it is going to work any hardship on any body. For reasons best known to the majority of the Select Committee they have voted for the exclusion of sub-tenancy as a franchise qualification. In the present franchise qualification even literacy has been omitted. This again takes out a considerable percentage of workers from the electoral rolls. In the absence of sub-tenancy and literacy as franchise qualifications, I think, Sir, nearly 80 or 85 per cent of the factory workers of the City will not have the vote. I therefore plead that this House will accept my amendment that the number of seats be increased to six."

* Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Basu Dev, to give increased representation to the Adi-Dravidas. I also happen to be a representative of the Adi-Dravidas and so I take this opportunity of supporting this amendment. In the course of his speech my hon. Friend dragged the recent expression of opinion by Dr. Ambedkar and I would say, Sir, whatever he might have said in his personal capacity does not affect either myself or my community in this Presidency. But being a beneficial amendment I support it."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"In moving this amendment my hon. Friend, Mr. Basu Dev, has not stated how to get the seat. As far as the position of the Government is concerned, Government are of opinion that in the interests of administration the total strength of the Corporation should not exceed 65. Within those limits it is the business of the House to adjust the representation and the claims of the various communities. Before proceeding to vote on the amendment now before the House, hon. Members will have to first make up their minds where to get these additional seats from. Apart from that, it will be very difficult, for, merely speaking on the merits of the question, when the Adi-Dravidas are here given three seats there are no valid reasons why four should not be given or five should not be given. So we are trying to fit in the claims of the Adi-Dravidas as far as possible and to save time we have given them the right to contest the other seats. But if we are to go on increasing the number of seats I do not know where it will lead us to. As regards the seats for labour, I presume apart from the seats specially reserved to represent labour, the labour population in our Corporation will be in a position to influence the choice of divisional councillors in a number of divisions. I therefore feel, Sir, that what is now proposed to be given is the minimum and they are not debarred from contesting other constituencies. It is the minimum, in order to see that they have necessary representation in the Corporation to put forth their views on questions. Because seats reserved for labour and Adi-Dravidas are limited in numbers they are not debarred from contesting other seats. I do not feel that the interests of the Councillors elected by the divisions

4th November 1935] [The Raja of Bobbili]

necessarily conflict with the interests of these communities. If we are to avoid confusion I appeal to hon. Members of this House to go on the basis of the Select Committee report."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I have not been able to follow the Hon. the Chief Minister in his arguments. Either he has given too much or he has given too little. If he thinks these people are important enough to influence the results in an election, then there is no need at all to secure to them special representation by means of reservation or by means of a special electorate. The whole point of the mover of this amendment is that if the franchise had been more democratic, then this increase would not be necessary. As things are, my Hon. Friend the Chief Minister bases his arguments on the contention that 65 is the possible maximum, and anything more than that would mean inefficiency in the Corporation. I do not see why we should give to 65 this mystic significance and why some increase should be regarded as so objectionable. If we are going to give them separate representation at all, it seems to me it should be a representation on an adequate scale. In a big city like Madras problems pertaining to the habitations of the poor Adi-Dravidas and factories and places where the labourers congregate are not only of special importance now, but as the city grows, they will be of increasing importance. Anybody who has seen Bombay or Calcutta knows what a ghastly feature the slums there present. I think more adequate representation of these two categories, Adi-Dravidas and Labourers, would make for the efficiency of municipal administration in this city. 12 noon.

"Then again my Hon. Friend the Chief Minister says there is nothing to preclude them from contesting the general seats. It seems to me, if you are going to give them separate electorates, if you are going to segregate them for purposes of their own representation from the general public, the chances of their being welcome as candidates in general constituencies will to that extent become less and not more. I can understand the existence of such a system as now prevails in the district boards where there are joint electorates, some of the Adi-Dravidas being chosen as candidates for general seats and also their trying to come at the head of the polls. But once you introduce this system of compartmental representation, the idea of trying to get the benefit of both the worlds, namely, separate representation through compartmental constituencies as well as being chosen as candidates for a general constituency, is almost an impossible thing. I therefore think that a case has been made out and would request the Hon. the Chief Minister to see even if he could not meet me in full, whether he could not meet me to some extent."

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"In reply to the Hon. the Chief Minister I would like to refer to what happened in the Select Committee. The question of the maximum strength of the council was put off till after the claims of the various interests like Commerce, University, Railways, etc., were discussed and the number of their representatives decided

[Mr. C. Basu Dev]

[4th November 1935]

upon. But just as I moved for the representation of Labour, then instead of considering this claim also it was suddenly and I say unfairly decided that the Committee should proceed to fix the strength of the Council. The consequence was that Labour got only the leavings of the table after the claims of every influential interest was more or less satisfactorily settled. This, Sir, was very unfair and to confirm it here will be grossly unjust and unfair. If really the anxiety of the Government or the Select Committee was not to exceed a fixed number for the strength of the Corporation Council, they ought to have proceeded first to consider it; that was not done. But now the Hon. the Chief Minister says that it is not possible to increase the number fixed. I am very glad to find that my hon. Friend from Chittoor has supported my case with his usual intelligence and eloquence. As he said there is no mystic significance in the number 65. Is it contended by the Hon. the Chief Minister that such prominent members as constitute the various Indian Commercial Associations in this City are unable to make their influence felt in the course of the elections to the general seats that they need to be given special representation? Take the present strength of the Corporation Council; how many of them are there who belong to the poorer and middle classes and how many who belong to the richer classes, and what influence they exert on the former? That will show the necessity that in the new constitution the interests of the poorer classes will have to be adequately safeguarded. If there is any objection to increasing the strength of the Corporation, I would very respectfully urge that the five seats which are now proposed to be given to the Indian Commercial bodies, be utilized for the purpose of my amendment. As it is, not more than 10 per cent of these workers will have the qualification to come into the electoral rolls of constituencies and 90 per cent will not have votes. Further it is wrong to contend that the worker has influence in deciding the results of elections. It is only the bourgeoisie classes that have influence and certainly not the workers. I therefore once more very earnestly and respectfully plead for the acceptance of the amendment."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that there is no special fascination or significance in the number 65. What I have to state is we spent much time over this question, we had to fix some number and 65 appeared to be the reasonable number, which would give the Council a manageable size. If it is increased by 5 or 10, I do not mean to say that it will be unmanageable or it will be against the interests of the administration. I am sure hon. Members will realize that all these proportions of representation have been fixed having in view the maximum. If you are to depart from that maximum, naturally the other interests represented will be entitled to ask that their representation be increased proportionately. The question is not whether the Adi-Dravidas should get one more seat or Labour should get four more seats. Is it this principle on which the House should proceed, viz., that we should give reasonable safeguards to the

4th November 1935] [The Raja of Bobbili]

interests of Labour and the Depressed classes by representing them in the Corporation, so that whenever questions affecting their welfare and interests come up they will be able to place their case for the consideration of the Council, or is it our desire and intention that we should give them representation so that their view should prevail in the Council by force of numbers and votes? If it is the latter you will have to proceed on a different basis altogether. I may also bring it to the notice of the hon. Members who have taken part in the discussions, that we have made another provision in the Act as regards Adi-Dravidas which runs as follows:—

‘ If on the preparation of the electoral roll under sub-section (1), the number of Adi-Dravidas thereon does not bear to their population in the City at the census immediately preceding the preparation of the roll, the same proportion as that which the aggregate number of electors of other communities bears to the total population in the City of such communities, the Local Government may prescribe such special qualifications as they may deem fit, in order to make up the deficiency. All the Adi-Dravidas possessing the qualifications so prescribed shall be included in the electoral roll.’

“ I may also state that so far there has not been even this reservation. I therefore appeal to the hon. Members for the present to accept the proposal in the Bill. I am sure the interests of these classes are sufficiently safeguarded in the Bill.”

The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ I shall put the two parts of the amendment separately.

“ The first part of the amendment, viz.—in sub-section (1) (a) of clause 4 in line 3, *substitute ‘ four ’ for ‘ three ’.*”

The amendment was declared carried.

The Hon. the Raja of Bobbili demanded a poll, and the House divided thus:

Ayes.

12-15
p.m.

1 Mr. M. Devadasan.	12 Mr. P. Peddi Raju.
2 " P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.	13 " K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
3 " V. G. Vasudeva Pillai.	14 " M. S. Sreshta.
4 Dr. P. Subbarayan.	15 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
5 Diwan Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.	16 Mr. T. Narasa Reddi.
6 Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.	17 " H. M. Jagannatham.
7 " V. T. Arasu.	18 " C. Basu Dev.
8 B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur.	19 " U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
9 Rao Bahadur P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.	20 " C. Ramalinga Reddi.
10 Rao Sahib A. S. Alagannan Chettiyar.	21 Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmiopathi.
11 Mr. K. Ahmed Meeran Sahib.	22 Mr. P. Ratnavelu Thevar.
	23 " G. R. Premayya.
	24 " K. Koti Reddi.

Noes.

1 The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu.	8 Diwan Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
2 " Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.	9 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
3 " Mr. C. A. Souter.	10 Mr. W. Scott Brown.
4 " Mr. G. T. H. Bracken.	11 " H. R. Uzielli.
5 " the Raja of Bobbili.	12 " C. E. Jones.
6 " Mr. P. T. Rajan.	13 " G. T. Boag.
7 " Diwan Bahadur Kumaraswami Reddiyar.	14 " R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
	15 " T. B. Russell.

[4th November 1935]

Noes—cont.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 16 Mr. T. Sundara Rao Nayudu. | 29 Rao Bahadur D. Krishnamurti. |
| 17 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. | 30 Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo. |
| 18 Mr. R. M. Palat. | 31 The Zamindar of Bodinayakkanur. |
| 19 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai Pillai. | 32 The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 20 Sir William Wright. | 33 Mr. G. Sriramulu. |
| 21 Mr. D. M. Reid. | 34 „ J. Kuppuswami Choudari. |
| 22 „ W. K. M. Langley. | 35 „ C. Indrayya. |
| 23 The Zamindar of Kirlampudi. | 36 „ K. Pattabhiramayya. |
| 24 Rao Bahadur B. P. Sessa Reddi. | 37 Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur. |
| 25 Mr. G. F. F. Foulkes. | 38 Mr. M. Vedachala Mudaliyar. |
| 26 „ F. J. Stanes. | 39 Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu. |
| 27 Khan Bahadur Javad Hussain Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 40 „ D. V. Narasimhaswami. |
| 28 Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu. | 41 Mr. K. Kesavaramamurti Nayudu. |
| | 42 „ P. V. Krishnayya Choudari. |
| | 43 Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur. |

Neutral.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1 Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai. | 4 Mr. K. P. Raman Menon. |
| 2 K. P. V. S. Muhammad Meera Ravuttai Bahadur. | 5 Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar. |
| 3 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 6 Mr. P. M. Thangal. |
| | 7 Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi. |

Ayes 24. Noes 43. Neutral 7.

The motion was lost.

The second part of the amendment, viz.—

“In line 4 of sub-section (1) (a) of clause (4), for the word ‘two’ substitute the word ‘six’”

was then put and declared lost.

Mr. C. Basu Dev demanded a poll and the House divided thus:

Ayes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1 Mr. M. Devadasan. | 7 Mr. P. Ratnavelu Thevar. |
| 2 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | 8 „ K. P. Raman Menon. |
| 3 Mr. C. Basu Dev. | 9 Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar. |
| 4 „ U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt. | 10 Mr. P. M. Thangal. |
| 5 „ C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 11 Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi. |
| 6 Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmiopathi. | 12 Mr. K. Koti Reddi. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1 The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu. | 15 Mr. T. B. Russell. |
| 2 „ Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam. | 16 „ T. Sundara Rao Nayudu. |
| 3 „ Mr. C. A. Souter. | 17 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. |
| 4 „ Mr. G. T. H. Bracken. | 18 Mr. R. M. Palat. |
| 5 „ the Raja of Bobbili. | 19 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai Pillai. |
| 6 „ Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 20 Sir William Wright. |
| 7 „ Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. | 21 Mr. D. M. Reid. |
| 8 Diwan Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 22 „ W. K. M. Langley. |
| 9 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma. | 23 The Zamindar of Kirlampudi. |
| 10 Mr. W. Scott Brown. | 24 Rao Bahadur B. P. Sessa Reddi. |
| 11 „ H. R. Uzielli. | 25 Mr. V. G. Vasudeva Pillai. |
| 12 „ C. E. Jones. | 26 „ Mr. G. F. F. Foulkes. |
| 13 „ G. T. Boag. | 27 „ F. J. Stanes. |
| 14 „ R. Madanagopal Nayudu. | 28 Khan Bahadur Javad Hussain Khan Sahib Bahadur. |

4th November 1935]

Noes—cont.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 29 Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu. | 46 Diwan Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyyar. |
| 30 Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai. | 47 Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 31 Rao Bahadur D. Krishnamurti. | 48 „ V. T. Arasu. |
| 32 Srikan M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo. | 49 B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur. |
| 33 Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schammad Sahib Bahadur. | 50 Rao Bahadur P. C. Muthu Chettiyyar. |
| 34 The Zamindar of Bodinayakkanur. | 51 Rao Sahib A. S. Alagannan Chettiyyar. |
| 35 The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. | 52 Mr. P. Peddi Raju. |
| 36 Mr. G. Sriramulu. | 53 „ Muhammad Meera Ravuttar. |
| 37 „ J. Kuppuswami Choudari. | 54 „ K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder. |
| 38 „ C. Indrayya. | 55 „ M. A. Muthiah Chettiyyar. |
| 39 „ K. Pattabhiramayya. | 56 „ T. Narasa Reddi. |
| 40 Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur. | 57 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 41 Mr. M. Vedachala Mudaliyar. | 58 Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari. |
| 42 Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu. | 59 Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur. |
| 43 „ D. V. Narasimhaswami. | |
| 44 Mr. K. Kesavaramamurti Nayudu. | |
| 45 Dr. P. Subbarayan. | |

Ayes 12.

Noes 59.

The motion was lost.

* Mr. M. DEVADASAN :—“ Sir, I beg to move—

‘ In sub-section (1) (a), add the following at the end:—

“ and two, to seats specially reserved for Indian Christians ”.’

The population of the Madras city consists of all classes and castes of people including the Indian Christians. The number of Hindu voters comes to nearly 79,677 and the Christian voters number 6,346. Anglo-Indian voters number 3,420. Section 5 (1) allots seats for the various interests such as the Madras Chamber of Commerce, the Madras Trades Association, the Southern India Chamber of Commerce, the Andhra Chamber of Commerce, the Nattukkottai Nagarathars' Association, the Southern India Skins and Hides Merchants' Association, the Piece-Goods Merchants' Association and the Rice and Grains Merchants' Association, the Anglo-Indian Association, the Port Trust of Madras, the South Indian Railway and the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Companies, the Senate of the Madras University and so on. In the Select Committee there was nobody representing the interests of the Indian Christians and in consequence their claims were not fully considered. I hear that a memorandum was submitted by the Indian Christian Association requesting the provision of seats for Indian Christians. That has not been accepted. I do not know why they have not taken into consideration the interests of the Indian Christians. This community is a separate class apart and it will be impossible to safeguard their interests if proper representation is not given to them. The interests of the Indian Christians are now being neglected as the interests of the depressed classes were neglected in the past. Recently there was a chance for electing a Christian as the Mayor of the Madras Corporation, but nobody supported that claim as the Christians are not so rich and influential as other class of people. This is an indication as to what the fate of the Indian Christians will be in a general electorate. I submit, Sir, that I have moved this motion

[Mr. M. Devadasan]

[4th November 1935]

because an injustice has been done to the Indian Christians. I have not given notice of many amendments. Only in very necessary cases I have given notice of amendments and this is one of them. I hope the Hon. Minister will, without difficulty, accept this amendment and give at least two seats to the Indian Christians. On a population basis, when 40 seats have been allotted for the Hindu population which consists of 79,677 voters, the Indian Christians are justly entitled to three seats. The Hon. Mr. Pannirselvam who was time and again representing the interests of the depressed classes and the Indian Christians, after his elevation to the Treasury Bench, does not pay sufficient attention to them. The Indian Christians are thus handicapped. With these few words I request the Hon. Minister to accept my amendment."

12-30
p.m.

Diwan Bahadur A. APPADURAI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, as an Indian Christian Member representing the city of Madras, I think it is incumbent upon me to place before this House a few facts in support of the motion which was moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Devadasan, and which runs as follows:—

'In sub-section (1) (a), add the following at the end:—

"and two, to seats specially reserved for Indian Christians".'

Sir, this has been done with a view to secure two seats at least for Indian Christian members. Sir, it is well known that Indian Christians form one-tenth of the population of Madras. If sixty seats are to be allotted for the various communities and interests on the Madras Corporation, it stands to common reason that at least one-tenth portion of the number of seats should be set apart for Indian Christians. Unfortunately Indian Christians are not in a position to command men and money to influence the elections. That is the reason why it has not been possible in the past to put forward Indian Christian candidates to stand for election to the Madras Corporation. You will be pleased to see, Sir, that in the Corporation, as now constituted, there is a solitary Indian Christian. My hon. Friend, Mr. Sundara Rao Nayudu, says that there are two elected Indian Christians on the Corporation Council but he cannot give the names of those two. I would like to ask him whether as Secretary to the Hon. the Chief Minister he is not contradicting himself when he says that he cannot give the names."

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—"On a point of personal explanation. Not that I did not want to mention the names of the two Indian Christian members. Of course, if the hon. Member presses me, I may say for his information that Mrs. Hanen Angelo and Mr. Chakkarai Chetti are the two Indian Christian members representing the Indian Christian community."

Diwan Bahadur A. APPADURAI PILLAI:—"I am sorry for the knowledge of the hon. Gentleman, Mr. T. Sundara Rao Nayudu, who says that Mrs. Hanen Angelo represents the Indian Christian community. Mrs. Hanen Angelo is an Anglo-Indian lady. There is only one Indian Christian in the Corporation Council. Last time when the

4th November 1935] [Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai]

question of offering the Mayoralty of the Corporation of Madras to an Indian Christian came up for consideration, his claims were passed over. The grounds on which his claims were passed over need not be discussed here.

"Sir, though one-tenth of the population of Madras is Indian Christian, it is not possible for them to get through election. That door is not open to them for the simple reason that they are wanting in men and money. But, Sir, the community is a very important community. As the Hon. House knows, from the point of view of education, steadfastness and balance of judgment the Indian Christian community is one of the most forward communities. Fidelity has been the watchword of the community and the achievements of the members of the community stand to-day as a monument of the community's steadiness in purpose and common sense. In the matter of education a number of educational institutions, in the matter of public health a number of hospitals, and in the matter of public morality a number of rescue homes and the like are all results of Christian endeavour. It is unnecessary for me to point out that it is necessary on the part of the Corporation to have a few more Indian Christian members on its Council so that they may ventilate the grievances of the Indian Christian community. I find that an *ad hoc* committee which discussed this Bill has recommended that two seats should be reserved for the Indian Christian community. The Corporation when dealing with this report was kind enough to suggest three seats. Unfortunately, now according to this Bill, no seat has been reserved for the Indian Christian community. The Select Committee which considered this Bill has recommended that no reservation should be made for any community whatsoever. I find from the proceedings of the Select Committee, page 13, that there was a general discussion on the subject of representation of the depressed classes, Mussalmans and minorities on the Council. Mr. Basu Dev proposed that the consideration of the fixing of the total number of seats be adjourned to the next meeting. The motion was lost.

"I take it that it was the decision of the Select Committee that no reservation of seat should be made or could be made for any community whatever and it should apply to Indian Christians also. But my point is that unfortunately in the Select Committee that sat to consider the City Municipal Bill, a very important Bill with reference to the residents of this city, there was no representative of the Indian Christian community and the proof of the pudding is in the eating of it. Here is the proof that the interests of the Indian Christians have not been pressed with that amount of persuasion which would otherwise have been possible. If no reservation is being made for any community, I would never have suggested the reservation of seats to my community. Here we find reservation of two seats for Adi-Dravidas and two seats for labour. My hon. Friend, Mr. Basu Dev, attempted vainly that the number of seats reserved for these communities might be increased from 3 to 4 and from 2 to 3. My submission is that Indian Christians are

[Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai] [4th November 1935]

in no way better than the Adi-Dravidas or labourers. Most of the Indian Christians are wage-earners and are employed in various services, either in Government, or Corporation or local bodies. Most of them are salaried men without any property. They are scattered throughout the city. There is no single division in Madras where the Indian Christians are not found. Most of them are living as sub-tenants in crowded houses and they are in no way better than the Adi-Dravida brethren or the labourers. At any rate the Adi-Dravidas are very strong in numbers but unfortunately the members of my community are not in position to make themselves felt, because they are not so numerically strong, nor do they congregate in any particular locality. There are one or two places, it may be mentioned, where the Indian Christians are found in large numbers, for instance, in Rayapuram and Purasawakam. Unfortunately no member of that community has been elected from either of those two places to represent the Indian Christians on the Corporation Council. That is proof positive of my statement that they are not in a position to contest any seat in election and they will not be successful unless reservation is made.

“These are the grounds on which I would appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister to revise if possible the decision of the Select Committee not to reserve any seat for any community.

“There is one point which has already been urged, viz., that the maximum number of members has been fixed at 65. I suppose there is no magic attached to that number. I do not think a House which consists of 65 members would become unmanageable if it is increased to 68 or 70. For the matter of that some of the members might be absent and in that case the members present will be often less than 65 and the Council will thus be quite manageable. On this consideration I would suggest very respectfully that the Indian Christian representation might be granted in the manner suggested in the amendment.

“There is one more point that I would like to urge for the favourable consideration of this Hon. House. I would like to refer to what is contained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to the Bill when it was originally introduced and it reads as follows:—

‘The system of nominations as it at present exists will go and the representation of minority communities will be secured not by reservation of seats as is the case in mufassal local bodies, but by so adjusting the divisions in the city as to secure as far as possible the return of members of the various communities, e.g., Nungambakkam division, could be so subdivided as to return a member of the depressed classes, representing cheris and a European from the other half. Similarly a predominantly Muslim area could be expected to return Muslim members. Power is proposed to be taken to alter the boundaries of the divisions from time to time.’

12-45 P.M. “Unfortunately such a device would not be helpful in the case of the Indian Christian community, for the simple reason that it is not possible to locate them in any particular division. Adjustment of boundaries applicable to depressed classes and Europeans may not apply in the case of Indian Christians with the same force. The Indian Christian voters—six thousand or ten thousand in number—are scattered

4th November 1935] [Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai]

in all the divisions of the City and it is not possible to adjust the boundaries of any division in such a way as to give a bias in favour of Indian Christians. I would beg the Hon. the Chief Minister to note that peculiar position in the case of Indian Christians and see if it is not possible to reserve a few seats for them and remove their grievance that they have been denied any representation whatsoever on the Corporation of Madras. With these remarks, I heartily support the motion moved by my hon. Friend Mr. Devadasan."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—"Mr. President, Sir, I wish to support this resolution on a question of principle. So far, there has been no reservation of seats for any minority community on the Corporation of Madras. But now, for the first time, the principle of reservation is introduced. That being so I cannot understand why one minority community should be treated in one fashion and another minority community in another. In the case of the depressed classes, reservation of seats has been approved of; in the case of labour, another minority community, reservation of seats has been approved of. (An hon. Member. Labour is not a community but a class.) That is worse still. If a class is allowed to have reservation of seats, why not a community? As regards Muslims, I understand that reservation was recommended, but in the meeting of the Select Committee, the Muslims did not want reservation because only a certain number of seats were recommended for reservation while they wanted more and rather than have a smaller number reserved they did not want any reservation at all. But in the case of Indian Christians, no offer was made at all. For if we had been offered, we are such a meek and humble community that we would have accepted what was offered. Even now the number asked for is only two and I do not see what difficulty there will be in giving this number. I earnestly appeal to the Hon. the Raja Sahib who is piloting this Bill to grant the very modest request of the Indian Christians. It might be asked whether as a matter of fact the present practice has worked injustice. I find that there is only one Indian Christian member on the Corporation, whereas the population of Indian Christians justifies about four. That gives you an idea of the treatment that the Indian Christians get so far as representation is concerned. Now under the new Act also they would be entitled to about four or five seats and the reservation of only two seats asked for, will not greatly increase the number of Indian Christians in the Corporation. Probably they will get only one unreserved seat and two reserved seats, altogether three seats. So they will not get a disproportionate number of seats. If there is any fear that by this reservation Indian Christians would be getting a number of seats disproportionate to their number, then I say, Sir, that the Hon. Chief Minister would be justified in opposing my proposition. But as it is, I do not see on what grounds this request can be refused. My hon. Friend, Mr. Appadurai Pillai, gave a large number of reasons why the Indian Christian community should be treated with some consideration. I do not want to go into all those grounds. But I only want to state a few grounds. It might be that in

[Mr. M. S. Sreshta] [4th November 1935]

the case of the Mussalmans they expect to have a large number elected under the new Act. As a matter of fact they are getting a large number elected under the present Act. But why cannot the Indian Christians get a proportionate number elected? The reason is, first of all, Indian Christians are very poor. There are a few well-to-do people of course. In education also they are a little more advanced than other minority communities, but their poverty stands in the way. Another reason is they are all scattered about in the City. 'A miss is as good as a mile'—as the proverb says. Indian Christians are smaller in number than other communities and they have no chance of being elected in the general electorate. If you had a system of proportional representation as they have in some other countries, it might not be necessary to have any reservation nor any system of separate electorates. It might be asked, why sitting on this side of the House where we have as a rule stood for joint electorates, I support a system of reservation. I say I am not entirely wedded to a system of joint electorates. If I spoke in favour of joint electorates and if I am now erring, I may say I am erring in good company, for the hon. Lady Member Mrs. Lakshmipathi also the other day said that Indian Christians should get proper consideration in regard to seats, that they should not merely get the seats reserved for them in certain areas but also be allowed to vote in the general electorate. Therefore my position is not at all antagonistic to any position I have hitherto taken up, because I feel that till the time is ripe for a general joint electorate we ought to have reservation of seats for the minority community either by means of special electorates or otherwise. As I pointed out, our request is for equality of treatment; it is not for inequitable treatment. We do not want any preferential treatment. We want merely equitable and equal treatment and the facts which I have quoted are more eloquent than any arguments which may be adduced by any of us in favour of the resolution which has been moved by my hon. Friend. I trust that this resolution will find favour with the Government and will not meet with opposition from hon. Members of this Council."

* Diwan Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I did not want to intervene in the debate but for the remark made by Diwan Bahadur Appadurai Pillai to the effect that Indian Christians are not recognized in the City of Madras. I say, Sir, he is not correct when he says that. It is well known, Sir, that for a very long time from time immemorial the leader of the northern part of the City was Mr. R. N. Prakasa Mudaliyar. Afterwards his brother Mr. Danapala Mudaliyar represented the northern part of the City in the Corporation. Though they are Indian Christians they keep the Mudaliyar title. Then again, Sir, there is Mr. Chakrai Chettiyar an Indian Christian. He stood for election in a Mudaliyar division against a Mudaliyar and he defeated the Mudaliyar by a large majority and was returned to the Corporation. What about Mr. M. Ratnaswami and various other Indian Christians who occupy high offices? Dr. Asirvada Nadar was for about nine years and more representing a Hindu division in the Corporation

4th November 1935] [Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

of Madras. I do not think there was one Indian Christian in Mr. Chakrai Chettiyar's division. With all that, the Hindus and the people of other communities supported him against the people of their own communities. The real fact of the matter is that there are not enough Indian Christian candidates. What is Mr. Appadurai Pillai doing, I ask? Could he not stand for election in the Purasawakam division? If he did, he would be elected. He is well known to all the Hindu families in the City of Madras. Why should he not stand for election instead of saying that there is no reservation of seats? He would not stand for election nor would other Indian Christians stand. (Mr. M. S. Sreshta: 'Why?') If they stood for election, we Hindus and people of other communities are ready to support Indian Christian candidates. I do not want to oppose reservation of seats for any community, for all my life I have stood for the principle of separate electorates and reservation of seats."

Diwan Bahadur A. APPADURAI PILLAI:—"On a point of information, Mr. President. The hon. Member has asked why I and Indian Christians like myself did not come forward and contest elections. It is for the simple reason that we did not find unanimity amongst ourselves and we did not find enough supporters. The Purasawakam division was recently contested by an Indian Christian. But a Hindu had a better chance and Mr. Damodara Nayudu was returned. There are various reasons for this which you are aware of."

* Diwan Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"If there is no unanimity among them, other communities are not responsible. They need not have any fear that because they would have to stand against Hindus they would not be supported. If a Christian of ability and good position stands for election, the Hindus, Muslims and people of other communities are sure to elect him. Moreover, Sir, in the first division, it was a Christian who defeated a Christian and not a Hindu. In the case of Danapala Mudaliyar, it was Mrs. Hannen Angelo who defeated him. The Hindus have always supported Indian Christians whether Anglo-Indian Christians or Indian Christians stood for election. For a number of years, till his death, Sir, R. N. Prakasa Mudaliyar was accepted as the leader by the Hindus and other communities. Why should Mr. Appadurai Pillai fear when there are so many instances like this? As I said before I am not against the reservation of seats for Indian Christians on the Corporation, I am not against even a separate electorate, for all along separate electorate and reservation of seats has been my life principle. If the Government thinks that Indian Christians should have seats reserved for them, let them reserve the seats. But what I want to do is to assure Mr. Appadurai Pillai that he need not have any doubts about Hindu support for Christian candidates. Did not the Hindus and other communities combined elect Mr. Swami-kannu Pillai as the President of the Council and later on Mr. Ratnaswami? I believe that it is the Hindu Ministers that made it a point of supporting Indian Christians and made Mr. Ratnaswami,

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [4th November 1935]

Principal of Law College. It was probably due to their efforts that Mr. Ratnaswami was made a Member of the Services Commission. Indian Christians can have no grievance against the Hindu community whether Brahman or non-Brahman and other communities as Muslims."

(Mr. M. S. Sreshta rose up to speak.)

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will give the hon. Member another turn."

* Diwan Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"The Council and everybody elsewhere have proved that they are for Indian Christians. If I may say so, Sir, mostly the Justice Party is responsible for Indian Christians occupying high places in the Presidency. I do not want to say more. It may be disputed, but it is my firm conviction, that reservation for some communities at present is a necessity. As I said before, Mr. Appadurai Pillai may insist upon reservation of seats and the Government may accept his proposition. I am not against it at all. But I only want to assure him that if he says 'I am afraid of other communities', he is wrong. He spent most of the time in Government service in the mufassal and therefore he did not know what was taking place in Madras and in the party of which he is the Chief Whip. Sir, this party is responsible for the high appointments held by Indian Christians and other minority communities and it is on that account harmony among all communities prevails in this Presidency."

1 p.m. Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—"On a point of personal explanation, Sir. My hon. Friend, Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar, has misunderstood what I said. The other day I asked for joint electorates in addition to special electorates in certain districts, i.e., special electorates in certain districts and joint electorates in other districts. It will work up to the ideal of joint electorates in all cases and no special electorates at all."

Mrs. K. ALAMELUMANGATHAYARAMMA then spoke in Tamil and the following is an English summary of the speech:—"Hon. Members who have spoken in favour of this amendment want that two seats should be reserved for Indian Christians. I am not speaking against the amendment. They seem to argue: three seats have been reserved for Adi-Dravidas; why not reserve seats for Indian Christians also? Indian Christians are more forward in all respects than Adi-Dravidas. They can easily be elected. There is no doubt about it, only if they stand for election; they never take the trouble of standing for election; they take active interest only in educating themselves, and in seeking good appointments; they do not stand for election; if they do so, they will surely be elected. In these days even women do not claim reserved seats or nomination; they are quite willing to stand for election. As such, Indian Christians should not ask for reservation of seats."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, the argument that has been advanced in support of this amendment is that no member of the Indian Christian community was on the Select Committee and that,

4th November 1935] [The Raja of Bobbili]

therefore, their case did not receive the attention it deserves. Whether a particular community is represented or not on the Select Committee, it is the responsibility of the Government to see that the interests of all the communities are provided for in legislation.

“ My hon. Friend, Mr. Appadurai Pillai, started enumerating the part played by the Indian Christian community and the services rendered to the country. I am glad to say that the Indian Christian community is certainly a valuable asset to the country, and the nation. If the Government or the framers of the Bill have left out the Indian Christian community for any special reservation, it is not because they consider the community as unimportant or insignificant; because it was felt that all the representatives of all the communities should be returned by joint electorates, we did not provide for special reservation or separate electorates for the Indian Christian community. It has been stated by those who are supporting this amendment, that, if no reservation at all was given to any community, they would not ask for it. I must state that reservation is being given to Adi-Dravidas, because up till now none of them has been returned to the Madras Corporation by the general electorate; they have always come in through the door of nomination. I hope that special reservation will be only a temporary feature and before long experience will prove that there would be no need for such reservation even for Adi-Dravidas. My hon. Friend, Mr. Appadurai Pillai, contradicts himself by saying that politically and economically Indian Christians in the City are in the same position as the depressed classes. As far as that part of his speech goes, I do not agree with him. By that, it should not be understood that the Government are against any special protection being given to the Indian Christians; we have proceeded on the basis that such of those communities which are being represented continuously on the Corporation by election need not be brought in by reservation. If we are to go back on that principle, will it not be necessary to recast the portion of the Act dealing with constitution and then provide for the representation of all minorities by reservation or otherwise? I therefore feel that it is not fair to find fault either with the Select Committee or with the Government for not providing reservation for Indian Christians. If, in spite of these observations of mine, my hon. Friends representing the Indian Christian community insist on special provision being made and if there is a general desire in all sides of the House, the Government will be prepared to consider the question of earmarking one of the 40 proposed divisions to that community by rotation.”

* Mr. M. DEVADASAN :—“ Sir, the Hon. Minister stated that special provision for reservation of seats made for the depressed classes and other communities is only temporary and it is intended to satisfy the interests of these people. He stated that there was no necessity for reservation of seats for Indian Christians. There is no reason why this temporary protection should not be extended to the Indian Christians also who

[Mr. M. Devadasan] [4th November 1935]

form a minority in the City of Madras till such time when no such protection is further needed. My hon. Friend, Mr. Appardurai Pillai, stated at the outset that the Indian Christians formed an important class in point of education; but with regard to their social, political and economic condition you will find that they are not so well off as other communities. Comparatively, they are placed in poor circumstances. It is but just fair and necessary that there should be reservation for Indian Christians. The Hon. Minister stated that there was no necessity for special representation for Indian Christians. This principle of reservation of seats for minority communities has been adopted in the case of municipalities and local boards. I do not find any reason why the same principle should not be adopted in the case of the City of Madras. My hon. Friends, Mr. Sundara Rao Nayudu and Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar, our Deputy President, have stated that they have always been kind to the Indian Christians by co-operating with them. Of course I welcome such an assurance. I appeal to them to extend the same co-operation and vote for this amendment. Both of them confused the issue by asking whether Anglo-Indians also were not Indian Christians. (Diwan Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar: 'Certainly not; I have much personal knowledge of these communities.') There is special provision for the Anglo-Indians. I do not see any reason why there should not be similar provision for the Indian Christians. My hon. Friends stated that many Indian Christians had been returned to the Corporation many times without any difficulty. I know of many cases where they had failed, although they were members of the Justice Party. The Hon. Minister was pleased to give us assurance that, if it was necessary, he would earmark one seat for Indian Christians. I appeal to him once more to reconsider the question and provide for reservation of seats for Indian Christians."

The amendment was put and lost.

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I should like to know from the hon. Member (Mrs. Rukmani Lakshmipathi) the implication of the two amendments Nos. 4 and 6."

* MRS. A. RUKMANI LAKSHMIPATHI:—"I shall move these amendments after discussion on amendment 2 is over. I beg to move the following amendment:—

'For sub-sections (1) (b) and (c), substitute the following:—

"six councillors elected jointly by the Madras Chamber of Commerce, the Trades Association and the Southern India Chamber of Commerce, one of these seats being reserved for Europeans".'

"In favour of this amendment I have not much to say except to advance the same old argument in favour of joint electorates. For the information of this House I may point out that the *ad hoc* committee

4th November 1935] [Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi]

appointed by the Government in 1929 to amend the Municipal Act of 1919, stated as follows:— 1-15 p.m.

‘Six councillors to be elected jointly by the Madras Chamber of Commerce, the Trades Association and the Southern India Chamber of Commerce, these to form one combined constituency. Three of the seats shall be reserved for Europeans.’

“That there must be community of interests as between European businessmen and Indian commercial men cannot be denied. So far as business is concerned, there should be no conflict of interests, because the Europeans have come to India to carry on business relations with us, and as such, they should identify themselves completely with the interests of the Indians. If they want that there should be friendship and mutual good relationship between themselves and Indian businessmen, they should favour this amendment. I am not however particular about the number of seats to be reserved for them, whether it is to be one or two or three. If they do not accept this amendment, namely, that one seat should be reserved for them, I am willing to accept the recommendation of the *ad hoc* committee. They should give the impression that though they are foreigners, they are one with the Indians. Of course there is no racial feeling here; and if there be any, it should not find a place here, and they should completely identify themselves with the interests of the Indians. For these reasons, Sir, I move this amendment.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“I beg to second this amendment. I hope my European friends here would agree to this amendment; and in case they find it impossible to agree, they would state frankly why it is as businessmen they do not want to be associated with fellow-Indian businessmen in the election of representatives to the City Council. At present, purely European industry and business is getting more and more mixed up with Indian capital than it used to be years ago. I see from the reports of most joint stock companies that on the directorate also there are a large number of Indians. The capital is probably as much Indian as European. So, time has brought about a close association among the European and Indian businessmen. It is true that they maintain separate chambers of commerce; but when one reads the resolutions of these bodies, excepting on questions of what I may call imperial interests or matters of politico-economic importance, their views on most of the current problems are identical. Even if there are differences, I do not think the European businessmen need be afraid of not receiving that recognition, which is due to their importance, from their Indian colleagues. I think we ought to be taking a step forward in this matter and proving the identity of business interests by trying to evolve common institutions in place of the separate ones that have so long existed. Therefore, I appeal to my European friends to agree to this amendment, and I am sure the Hon. the Chief Minister will not stand in the way of its being passed if the European representatives do not raise a protest. As I said, in case they find it impossible to

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [4th November 1935]

agree, they may state exactly the grounds on which they find the giving of institutional form to the identity of their business interests impossible.

"With your permission, Sir, I would change the word 'one' into 'three' in line 4 of the amendment, if the Mover also agrees."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I take it that the hon. Mover has no objection."

Mrs. A. RUKMANI LAKSHMIPATHI:—"I accept the suggestions to substitute the word 'one' by the word 'three'."

* Sir WILLIAM WRIGHT:—"Mr. President, Sir, I must express my regret that I have to oppose this amendment, in spite of what I may term the friendly way in which it has been proposed by my two friends on the opposite side of the House.

"I would first like to point out to the Hon. the Lady Member who moved this amendment that we are pleased to find that she does apparently accept the principle that there should be specific representation of mercantile interests in the Council and she also, I am particularly pleased to note, was prepared to accept the principle that, to some extent, mercantile representation should be European. Now I would ask the hon. the Lady Member who moved this amendment and the hon. Member who seconded it, whether if you are going to accept the principle that this representation is in the interests of Corporation, it will not surely be reasonable that those who are willing to provide that representation should have the last word in saying how their representatives are to be elected. Now I do not think that the Southern India Chamber of Commerce, any more than the Madras Chamber or, for that matter, any of the other bodies referred to in these two subsections, would wish for a joint electorate. I am sure reference will be made to this later on by members who belong to this House and who are members of the Southern India Chamber or the other bodies. But I would like here to say that the Madras Chamber of Commerce, although it is, of course, very predominantly European, has Indian members. I foresee in the future a time when there will be many more Indian members because of that very community of interests to which my friend the Lady Member has referred. I think if we look further into the future, although not into the immediate future, we shall have probably only one Chamber of Commerce in Madras representing all commercial interests. This however is not now the case.

"Sir, a challenge was made to me—I suppose it was extended to me as Chairman of the Madras Chamber of Commerce—to say what exactly is the reason for our objecting to this joint electorate. Well, Sir, the reply to this is very simple indeed. If we were to be a joint electorate I consider it would be essential that members of the two Chambers were elected in the same way, and that the qualifications for membership of the two Chambers should be the same. Now, Sir, the qualifications for membership of the two Chambers are very different indeed. The number of members in the Southern India Chamber is

4th November 1935] [Sir William Wright]

very much larger than in the Madras Chamber of Commerce and the members of the former are very largely elected—and I am sure that whoever speaks on behalf of the Southern India Chamber will confirm this—as individuals. The members of the Madras Chamber of Commerce are also to a large extent elected individually—they do not represent themselves but those large commercial organizations which have been built up during the last century and a half in Madras. I claim, Sir, that both the Madras Chamber and the Southern India Chamber have a very long history of useful work in the commerce and trade, and therefore in the prosperity of the City of Madras. I would like to see both these two bodies, and in fact all the bodies which are mentioned in those two sub-sections, continue their useful activities; and it is in the interests of the City Council itself I say that it is extremely important that each should have adequate representation. I do not think for one moment that the representation proposed to be given to these two bodies is excessive. I would therefore ask the House not to accept the amendment, but to allow the representation of the various commercial bodies, as recommended by the Select Committee to be embodied in this Bill."

The House then adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment. I do so not because there is any fear that the amendment would be carried or that those opposed to this amendment have not made out their case. Sir William Wright in his very clear and weighty speech made out a very strong case why this amendment ought not to be accepted. I rise only to express my gratitude, not only on my behalf, but also on behalf of the sober public of the City for the very excellent way in which the European element on the Madras Corporation had helped in the deliberations of that body. For their intelligent, unbiassed and independent opinion, the European group in the Madras Corporation has earned a name and also the gratitude of the public. Sir, the amendment has two aspects. One is to reduce the number of their representatives and the other to make them members of a joint electorate, so to say, along with the other Indian commercial bodies. Sir, I will not say much about the question of constituting a joint electorate, as the divergence in constitutions of the two different chambers is itself a very strong point against it. Sir, the other day when the Madras Maternity Benefit Bill was discussed and passed into law, my hon. Friend from Vellore, who sits by accident behind the Treasury Bench, but whose political opinions are really identical with those who sit opposite, had occasion to offer a very high compliment to the Madras Chamber of Commerce. When the opinions of the Madras Chamber of Commerce and the Southern India Chamber of Commerce were invited on this very salutary measure—the Madras Maternity Benefit Bill—which is now fortunately passed into an Act, the opinion which the Southern India Chamber of Commerce submitted for the consideration of the House

[Mr. C. Basu Dev]

[4th November 1935]

was reactionary and frightfully illiberal in itself and much more so when compared with the very useful and very practical suggestions for its improvement made by the Madras Chamber of Commerce. Then my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, had to pay a compliment to the sense of fairness and sense of proportion of the Madras Chamber of Commerce and to condemn the attitude of the South Indian Chamber of Commerce. Sir, in the interests of the public, I do not want that the liberal traditions and the generous impulses with which the members of the Madras Chamber of Commerce are inspired should be swamped by the reactionary and illiberal attitude of the members of the South Indian Chamber of Commerce. Sir, I hear cries from the Opposition. If only my hon. Friends would read the recommendations made by both the bodies on the Madras Maternity Benefit Bill, I am sure they will approve of what I have stated. Sir, with these few words, I very strongly oppose the amendment."

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"Mr. President, Sir, my hon. and learned Friend, Mr. Basu Dev, opened by saying that the hon. Gentleman who leads the European group in this House, Sir William Wright, has, in a very clear and exhaustive manner stated to this House, the reasons why the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mrs. Lakshmi-pathi, should be rejected. As far as I could see, I think the hon. Gentleman who leads the European group in this House has not at all made out any case against the amendment moved by Mrs. Lakshmi-pathi. Sir, a categorical question was put to the European group in this House by my hon. Friend, Mr. C. R. Reddi, and the question is this: what is the special reason or reasons that they have against the clubbing of the members of the Madras Chamber of Commerce and the South Indian Chamber of Commerce? Sir, I submit that that question remains unanswered. My hon. Friend, Sir William Wright, only stated in the course of his speech that the qualifications for membership of these two Chambers, namely, the South Indian Chamber of Commerce and the Madras Chamber of Commerce, are very different; whereas in the case of the Madras Chamber of Commerce the qualification for membership is connexion with a well-established business house, the qualification for the membership of the South Indian Chamber of Commerce is merely payment of a certain fee. I admit, Sir, that that is the case. I also admit the statement of the hon. Sir William Wright that the total number of members of the Madras Chamber of Commerce as compared with the total number of members of the South Indian Chamber of Commerce is very small and that there is the chance of the members of the South Indian Chamber of Commerce swamping and out-voting if both the Chambers should be clubbed together for election purposes. Sir, the third point made by the Hon. Sir William Wright is that the representation provided for in the Bill, namely, six seats for the European commercial interests and five for Indian commercial interests are not excessive and that they should be retained. I am in entire agreement with that position and I also admit the correctness of the statement made by my hon. Friend,

4th November 1935] [Mr. V. T. Arasu]

Sir William Wright. I here wish to repeat the question put by my hon. Friend, Mr. C. R. Reddi, and that is, what objection can there be to the two chambers being clubbed together if Europeans are assured of a certain number of seats on the Corporation? All that is required by the European community is that their community and their commercial interests should be represented on the Corporation by a certain number of members. If supposing out of the 11 seats provided for commerce as a whole, six seats are reserved for Europeans and the constituency is to be both the Chambers put together, what objection can there be to that suggestion? I, for one, am unable to understand why any reasonable set of people should take exception to that procedure, provided that the number of six is guaranteed to the Europeans. Sir, that is from the broader aspect of the question.

"Coming down to the other aspect, I personally feel that there is no need whatever for any separate representation being given to two different business communities in the City Corporation. Sir, I can understand separate representation being given to European commerce in a legislative body like the Provincial Legislative Assembly or the Federal Assembly, where questions concerning taxation and politico-economic questions of a very important nature are likely to be discussed and therefore it is essential that members of the European community should be represented on those bodies to give their considered opinions. But, in a small body like the Madras Corporation Council, where the questions that are likely to be discussed are matters concerning rates, health and sanitation, etc. I cannot understand why, for deciding whether we should have a ditch here or there or whether we should put up a building or not, construct a new school or not, there should be any separate representation for any business community whatever. Even granting for the sake of argument that some representation need be given, I do not feel that there is any need whatever for the business community to be divided into two separate classes. Already we have too many classes in this country and to divide the business community which constitutes one solid block into two, namely, European and Indian business community, is very unfortunate and should be put an end to.

"For these reasons, I think the amendment moved by Mrs. Lakshminpathi is very sound in principle, namely, that there should be a joint electorate and that the Europeans, if they insist on it, may be guaranteed certain number of seats. In that connexion, I would like to suggest that the number of seats allotted for Commerce, namely, six for European commerce and five for Indian commerce may be retained and out of this eleven, six seats may be reserved for European commerce. My important reason for suggesting that there should be a joint electorate, and if necessary, the European element may be assured of a certain number of seats is this: that the interests of both European and Indian commerce being identical are not likely to come into conflict, and therefore their outlook will be one and the same.

[Mr. V. T. Arasu]

[4th November 1935]

2-45
p.m.

“Therefore, there is no case for separate representation. The second and the more important reason is that the number of members of the Southern India Chamber of Commerce being greater than that of the Madras Chamber of Commerce, we can be sure of returning only such members of the European community as will sympathize with the national aspirations.”

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—“Mr. President, I think this question has been sufficiently thrashed out. As Sir William Wright pointed out, in the case of the Madras Chamber of Commerce, it is the institutions that are represented and in the case of the Southern India Chamber of Commerce generally individuals are elected to the chamber. That point has not been met by the various arguments made by hon. Members. It has always been the case that since this Act first came into force separate representation has been provided for the Madras Chamber of Commerce, the Trades Association and the Southern India Chamber of Commerce. Now we have clubbed together the Madras Trades Association and the Madras Chamber of Commerce into one constituency and the Southern India Chamber of Commerce and others into another. I do not see why we should go against the wishes of the institutions which are sought to be given representation. Therefore, I oppose the motion.”

Mrs. A. RUKMANI LAKSHMIATHI:—“Mr. President, I should like to make an appeal to the members of the Southern India Chamber of Commerce as also to the Madras Chamber of Commerce not to lay so much stress on the disparity of the qualification of voters who elect representatives to their respective chambers. The interests of business as a whole should be considered whether it be Indian business or business conducted by Europeans. Both the Chambers have therefore got to throw in their lot and elect common representatives to the City Corporation. There are no vital points of business that you are concerned with here. The Corporation councillors are expected to discharge civic functions, like looking into the health conditions of the City, the educational requirements, conservancy affairs and so on. There is not any special interest of European business that has to be considered. I am afraid my hon. Friend, Sir William Wright, has not made out any strong case against this amendment. He has not given any valid reasons for his objections except that there was disparity in qualification for membership of the two chambers of commerce. I do not see in what manner the European business will be placed in jeopardy. I appeal that in the national interests of the country and in the interests of the business solidarity, both chambers should get their representatives elected through a joint electorate. I would also appeal to my hon. Friend, Mr. Hameed Khan, and Mr. Narayanan Nambiyar to withdraw their amendments for giving separate representations to different associations, the Grain Merchants Association, the Hides and Skins Merchants Association and so on. The country is already divided into so many water-tight compartments and the result of such an amendment will be to divide the business

4th November 1935] [Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi]

community into further divisions. This is against national interests. Instead of bringing all classes of people together, we shall be dividing the business community into further compartments. If the hon. Members of the European group are trying to oppose my amendment, it means that they are trying to divide us and take away our solidarity from us. With these few words, I press my amendment."

* Sir WILLIAM WRIGHT:—"On a point of personal explanation. When speaking this morning, I never once suggested or asked for European commercial representation throughout my speech. I was dealing with the proposals in the Bill that six councillors should be elected by the Madras Chamber of Commerce, a not entirely European body, which is likely to be even less so in the future."

The amendment was put and lost.

Clause 4.—Section 5.

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Mr. President, I do not want to move the first amendment standing in my name but would move the alternative amendment, namely:—

'For sub-section 1 (c), substitute the following:—

"(c) Two councillors elected in such manner as may be prescribed, by Indian companies or Indians resident in Madras and engaged in trade, commerce or industry and paying an income-tax on an annual income of Rs. 3,000 and above."

"The object of my amendment is two-fold, firstly to reduce the representation for the Indian commerce and secondly to make it as broad-based as possible. I have already said how the number of Europeans in the Corporation should be as great as possible in the interests of the public. But I say that Indian commerce cannot claim for any representation and say that they have no influence in deciding the results of election. I am sure members of Indian commerce are influential persons who are, can, and always will, continue to dominate in the elections to the Corporation Council. Such being the case, I do not see why any representation at all is to be given to the Indian commerce. I do not want to be misunderstood as standing in the way of representation of the Indian commerce. As the Hon. the Chief Minister and a few other speakers have pointed out, the object of giving representation is not to give them adequate or sufficient voice but some voice through which they can express their grievance. If that is the object—and that ought to be the object—two seats for Indian commerce will be ample and that any more seat given to it will be at the expense of the general public. The recommendation of the Select Committee is not only to the Madras and Southern India Chamber but also that representation should be given to the Andhra Chamber of Commerce—a body of recent origin—the Nagarathars'

[Mr. C. Basu Dev]

[4th November 1935]

Association—I do not know how many of them are in Madras—the Skins and Hides Merchants and so forth. I know my hon. Friend, the Lady Member for the City, will join me in protesting against this provision. I am glad of the assurance of the hon. Member and I hope I shall have the persuasive and powerful eloquence of Mr. C. R. Reddi also on my side.”

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—“ Mr. President, Sir, I second the amendment of my hon. Friend. I do not know if this motion will share the same fate as the others of the morning. I think there ought to be some principle upon which representation is to be accorded to the various commercial bodies. I see that all interests have been clubbed together without rhyme or reason. I ask, Sir, what is the logical principle on which provision has been made for the various interests. I hope I shall not be misunderstood as opposing representation of Indian commerce. There are 40 general seats allotted for Hindus and other classes of people. Those members who might come in through general election may have various interests. With due deference to Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar, I say they can come in by general election and represent those interests. I think, Sir, two is enough for them, and this will enable other minorities to come in. By limiting five into two there must be sufficient provision for meeting the needs of other communities. So I second the amendment.”

3 p.m.

* Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—“ Sir, I am anxious to get as many places for commerce as possible whether European or Indian. I wish to say that the commercial representatives on the Corporation whether Indian or European have functioned well and I have no doubt that the other representatives will always say how useful commercial representatives have been in the Corporation in the management of its finance and various questions connected with economy and retrenchment in the Corporation. That aspect of the case I have no doubt hon. Members of the House would take note of. Indian commerce has been enjoying two seats though they have always been claiming for more. I should like very much to retain the other institutions also recommended by the Bill. Sir, it will be agreed that the interests of the Indian Chamber of Commerce are equally important and I am one who does not want to draw any distinction between Europeans and Indians as I always feel that both should be strongly represented. The institutions have been long established and they deserve representation and I have no doubt that the representation will be very effective on the Council. With regard to the suggestion of income-tax qualification I do not want to tire the House as I have stated my views while speaking on the Delimitation proposals. It may be that persons doing extensive business may not be paying income-tax in certain years. I therefore oppose the amendment.”

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—“ Sir, this proposal evoked keen discussion at the Select Committee stage as well as before that.

4th November 1935] [The Raja of Bobbili]

Government felt it undesirable to disenfranchise old established associations like the South Indian Chamber of Commerce. As this has to represent particular interests it is considered representations by institutions will be more effective in putting the view point of the commercial community before the public and the Corporation. Instead of that if we have constituencies consisting of those who pay income-tax on an annual income of Rs. 3,000 it was felt that when questions concerning the commercial community come up for discussion there is no possibility of the electorate being brought together to consider or deliberate on these questions. As this is a case of commercial representation it is considered that it is the most effective way of representation of commercial interests. Therefore the proposal under discussion now before the House was not acceptable and it was decided to adhere to the original proposals and give representations to institutions. I therefore oppose this amendment."

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I am sorry I did not hear arguments whatever in favour of as many as five seats to be given to Indian commerce. This question of equality of treatment of Indians with Europeans has been very longstanding. I remember as a student attending the sittings of the Statutory Commission on services whereat the Indian public men pleaded that the Indian Executive Councillor should draw as much salary as the European Executive Councillor, there should be no discrimination between Europeans and Indians and that as much money should be paid to Indians as has been paid to the Europeans. Similarly perhaps (A voice: 'Is it a reply?') I suppose, Sir, that the Select Committee had given nearly as many seats for Indian commerce as they had agreed to the Madras Chamber of Commerce on this very principle of equality of treatment. Sir, I am afraid, I will have to cause some inconvenience to the Members of the House by challenging a vote on this issue. On the other occasion with regard to increased representation to workers I had to cause some inconvenience for showing to the public what exactly is the attitude of this House to the poorer classes. This vote also will show how exactly reverse is the position."

The amendment of Mr. C. Basu Dev was put and declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1 Mr. C. Basu Dev.

| 2 Mr. M. Devadasan.

Noes.

1 The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu.
2 " Rao Bahadur A. T. Pan-
nirselvam.
3 " Mr. C. A. Souter.
4 " Mr. G. T. H. Bracken.
5 " Diwan Bahadur S.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
6 " Mr. P. T. Rajan.
7 " the Raja of Bobbili.

8 Rao Bahadur Dr. C. Natesa Mada-
liyar.
9 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
10 Mr. W. Scott Brown.
11 " H. R. Uzielli.
12 " G. T. Boag.
13 " R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
14 " T. B. Russell.
15 " T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.

[4th November 1935]

Noes—cont.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 16 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. | 39 Rao Sahib Pandit Ganala Ramamurti. |
| 17 Mr. R. M. Palat. | 40 Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi. |
| 18 Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan. | 41 Dr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 19 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai Pillai. | 42 Mr. V. T. Arasu. |
| 20 Sir William Wright. | 43 Rao Bahadur P. C. Muthu Chettiar. |
| 21 Mr. D. M. Reid. | 44 Mr. A. P. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai. |
| 22 „ W. K. M. Langley. | 45 „ K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder. |
| 23 Rao Bahadur B. P. Sessa Reddi. | 46 „ K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |
| 24 Mr. P. C. Moses. | 47 „ M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar. |
| 25 „ P. V. Rajagopala Pillai. | 48 „ M. S. Sreshta. |
| 26 „ G. F. F. Foulkes. | 49 „ K. M. Doraiswami Reddiar. |
| 27 „ F. J. Stanes. | 50 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 28 Khan Bahadur Jayad Hussain Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 51 Mr. T. Narasa Reddi. |
| 29 Mr. G. Simhachalam. | 52 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 30 Rao Bahadur D. Krishnamurti. | 53 Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar. |
| 31 Srinan M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo. | 54 „ U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt. |
| 32 Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur. | 55 Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 33 The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. | 56 Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. |
| 34 „ Bodinayakkanur. | 57 Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi. |
| 35 Mr. G. Sriramulu. | 58 Mr. K. P. Raman Menon. |
| 36 „ C. Indrayya. | 59 „ H. B. Ari Gowder. |
| 37 Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur. | 60 „ G. R. Premayya. |
| 38 Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu. | 61 „ C. E. Jones. |

Neutrals.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 4 Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu. |
| 2 Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj. | 5 „ K. Ahmed Meeran Sahib. |
| 3 „ D. V. Narasimhaswami. | |

Ayes 2. Noes 61. Neutral 5.

The amendment was lost.

3-15 p.m. * Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—“ Sir, I do not move amendment No. 14, but I move 14-A, which is as follows:—

‘ For sub-section (1) (c), substitute the following:—

“ (c) One councillor elected by the Southern India Chamber of Commerce.

One councillor elected by the Andhra Chamber of Commerce.

One councillor elected by the Nattukkottai Nagarathars' Association.

One councillor elected by the Southern India Skins and Hides Association.

One councillor elected by the Piece-goods Merchants' Association.

One councillor elected by the Rice and Grain Merchants' Association.”

4th November 1935] [Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar]

“ Sir, my reasons for moving this amendment are as follows: In the Bill as was introduced, six seats were provided for Indian commerce, but when it came to the Select Committee, this number was reduced to five. I am sure this House will agree with me that the number of seats allocated for Indian commerce should not in any way be reduced. My hon Friend, Mr. Basu Dev, thinks that Indian commercial representation should be limited to two. But the division on the amendment of Mr. Basu Dev is proof positive that the House is against the curtailment of the number of seats for Indian commerce. The amusing portion of Mr. Basu Dev's speech is the appeal for the support of Mr. C. R. Reddi in the matter. I realize the anxiety of Mr. Basu Dev to enlist the sympathy of Mr. C. R. Reddi as the time for the expiry of the life of the Council is approaching, but it is asking for the moon.

“ Again, apart from the fact that the Select Committee has reduced the number from six to five, from the point of convenience also my amendment ought to be accepted. The Select Committee has mentioned six commercial organizations for representation and provided only five seats.”

* Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—“ Mr. President, I second this amendment. I wish to point out that for six associations there are only five seats. I do not want on this occasion to speak on the necessity for representation for these associations for while speaking on the previous amendment I have given my reasons. So I shall content myself by pointing out that though I share the view that the South Indian Chamber should get more, as I find that the Government are committed to the total number of 65 being the strength of the Council and as they find it impossible to increase the number, I would move, with the permission of the Mover of this amendment that the last item in the list be deleted, in which case there will be five seats for the five associations ear-marked.”

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—“ Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment just now moved by Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar. It appears very strange that while the tendency now is to put an end to this division of the business community in India even into two classes, namely, European business community and Indian business community, an attempt should now be made to subdivide the Indian community into several minor groups. From that point of view I oppose it. My second reason is I can point out several instances of one gentleman being a member of practically all the associations given in the list. To be more precise I can point to an instance where a certain gentleman is a member of the South Indian Chamber of Commerce, of the Andhra Chamber of Commerce, of the Nattukkottai Nagarathars' Association. (Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar: ‘ Question.’). My friend can go on questioning, but I can point out definite instances where same gentlemen are members of more than three or four bodies mentioned in this list. I have one instance where a particular gentleman is a member

[Mr. V. T. Arasu]

[4th November 1935]

of the South Indian Chamber of Commerce, Andhra Chamber of Commerce, Southern India Skins and Hides Association, Piece-goods Merchants' Association. I can also name that gentleman—he is Janab Abdul Hakim Sahib. He is a member of the four associations and also happens to be president or vice-president of three. So I submit that it is unfair that a particular individual should be given the opportunity to vote in several associations. That would be giving undue advantage to certain gentlemen who happen to be in a fortunate position. This is a negation of the very principle of representation. For this reason, I think the House will reject the amendment altogether."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—"Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on this subject. It has been already decided that six councillors should be elected by the members of the Madras Chamber of Commerce and the members of the Madras Trades Association, and I think very rightly decided. If it is a joint election by a large number of associations it would be certainly difficult, especially so here. As my friend here pointed out, what connexion is there between Rice and Grain Merchants' Association and Skins and Hides Merchants' Association? It is quite possible that one member may be in both the associations, for the interests of one are entirely different from those of the other; they may be even adverse. But in any case, there are six associations and five members; that means to say, the five members will have to be elected by some sort of permutation and combination; it would be rather difficult. So it would be much easier for each association to select one member. The argument adduced by my friend on the other side that it would be very difficult to combine European with the Indian Association would apply to this subdivision of Indian business associations. The terms under which one can become a member of each association may be different. As I have pointed out, the class of people who enter these associations may be different, and then the interests are different. Therefore I think it would be certainly desirable that there should be as many members as there are associations so that there may be no difficulty in regard to representation. As regards the desirability of having business men in the Corporation, I think there can be no doubt about it whatever. In the Madras City in which so much business is being carried on, I think some importance must be given to people carrying on trade. I believe in London, practically the Mayor is a tradesman, and the aldermen are mostly tradesmen. That shows what important part trade plays in a corporation. With these words I support this amendment."

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"My hon. Friend, Mr. Nambiyar, while moving his amendment spoke about my seeking the sympathy of the hon. Member from Chittoor and how I would not be able to get the sympathy of the Congress. After I entered public life, especially this House, I had at no time attempted to canvass political sympathy from my opponents on false pretences. Perhaps my friend's observation is a reflection of what he has done."

4th November 1935]

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. member, Mr. Basu Dev, to-day especially, has been entertaining the House with too many irrelevant remarks. I would ask the hon. Member to please confine his remarks to the amendment before the House."

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I bow to your ruling, Sir, I am thankful to you for directing my remarks in the proper and relevant channel. I thought an unprovoked and irrelevant attack made against me needed reply, but in obedience to your ruling I shall take some other opportunity."

Mr. President, the vote of this House on the previous amendment showed how hollow was the sympathy feigned or affected by Members of this House to poorer classes, and how entirely capitalistic their outlook. I do not complain, but I hope the public will understand the position and see that at least in the next Council to be formed it shall be filled with members with greater sympathy for the poorer people and a greater sense of proportion, so that one interest however powerful may not be given a preponderating voice in any body, either this House or the local bodies. The hon. Member representing the South Indian Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Kumararaja of Chettinad, dealt with the claims of the various institutions which are now in this amendment. I do not have any facts as to what the special interests are, how the interests of one are opposed to those of the other, how the interests of the piecegoods merchants are in any way inimical to the interests of the Nattukottai Nagarathars, how the interests of the rice and grain merchants are opposed to those of the Andhra Chamber and so on. I would only say that this is a reactionary amendment, an amendment for the safeguarding of vested interests, without any reason at all behind it and without any sense of propriety in it. We are asked that every association that can possibly be conceived of should be given representation on the Corporation without giving any facts about them. It is an affront to the intelligence and understanding of this House. I am emphatically of opinion that the amendment ought not to be accepted by this House."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I understand, Sir, that my hon. Friend, Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar, has moved an amendment standing in his name, providing for separate representation for each of these institutions mentioned in the Bill as amended by the Select Committee, which in effect would mean increasing the number of seats allotted to the Indian commercial interests from five to six. I have already made it clear that it will not be possible for Government to accept any amendment which has the effect of increasing the total strength of the Council. I believe, Sir, subject to correction, that an amendment has also been moved to delete the Rice and Grain Merchants' Association. If this proposal meets with the general approval of the House, Government will have no objection to delete that item. At the same time I would say there must be some sort of elasticity in the rules, and instead of fixing one seat for each association which

[The Raja of Bobbili] [4th November 1935]

would mean that the South Indian Chamber of Commerce would have less representation than at present, it may be left to the Government by rules which may be prescribed, to give individual representation to some of the associations, or club them all together.

3-30 p.m. “ My hon. Friend, Mr. Arasu, has drawn attention to the fact that it would be most undemocratic to permit a single individual to exercise in the same constituency three or four votes. I am only speaking with reference to the amendment as proposed by the Select Committee and as it stands in the Bill as amended by the Select Committee. It is the intention that by having a common constituency each individual should vote only once. It was never the intention to allow a single individual, by virtue of his membership of different associations, to vote separately. In the result my proposal comes to this: that five councillors should be elected by the bodies other than the Rice and Grain Merchants' Association in the manner prescribed by Government.”

* Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—“ Mr. President, Sir, my hon. Friend, Mr. Arasu, in opposing my amendment asked why a distinction should be drawn between various commercial bodies. There is fundamental difference between general commercial interests and special commercial interests. The Indian Franchise Committee has said that functional representation is assuming increasing importance in the sphere of commerce. That being so, I think that representation provided for the commercial bodies mentioned is necessary. With reference to the amendment to my amendment, I have absolutely no objection to accept the deletion of the words ‘ one councillor elected by the Rice and Grain Merchants' Association,’ if that is the commercial opinion.”

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—“ Mr. President, my proposition is to delete the words ‘ and the Rice and Grain Merchants' Association ’ in clause 5 (1) (c). The idea is that instead of providing separate representation in the Bill itself, the method of providing whether each institution should have a separate seat or seats according to its importance may be left to the Government. That object will be achieved if 5 (1) (c) is left in the form found in the Select Committee Report and the words ‘ and the Rice and Grains Merchants' Association ’ are deleted.”

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—“ I agree to that also.”

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ The better procedure would be for somebody to move for the deletion of the words ‘ and the Rice and Grain Merchants' Association ’ from section 5 (1) (c).”

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—“ Mr. President, I move—

‘ In section 5 (1) (c) delete the words ‘ and the Rice and Grains Merchants' Association ’ occurring at the end ’.”

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—“ I second it.”

4th November 1935]

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"Sir, I should enter my emphatic protest against the proposed deletion. If any association should, on the basis of the number of members and the importance of the trade, be entitled to have representation, it is this Rice and Grain Merchants' Association. It has got a very large membership. If any Association should be deleted from 5 (1) (c), I suggest that the Nattukottai Nagarathars' Association may be deleted."

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—"Mr. President, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment to sub-section (1) (c)."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put to the House the amendment of Mr. M. S. Sreshta, viz., in sub-section (1) (c) to delete the words 'and the Rice and Grains Merchants' Association' occurring at the end."

The motion was put and declared carried.

Mr. V. T. Arasu demanded a poll and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1 The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.	21 Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayd.
2 " Mr. P. T. Rajan.	22 Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sabib Bahadur.
3 " The Raja of Bobbili.	23 Mr. G. Sriramulu.
4 Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu.	24 " J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
5 " T. B. Russell.	25 " C. Indrayya.
6 " T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.	26 Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu.
7 Khan Sahib Sayed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.	27 " D. V. Narasimhaswami.
8 Mr. R. M. Palat.	28 " Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
9 " V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.	29 Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
10 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai Pillai.	30 " M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
11 Sir William Wright.	31 " M. S. Sreshta.
12 Mr. D. M. Reid.	32 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
13 " W. K. M. Langley.	33 Mr. T. Narasa Reddi.
14 Rao Bahadur B. P. Sessa Reddi.	34 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
15 Mr. P. C. Moses.	35 Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
16 " G. F. F. Foulkes.	36 The Zamindar of Chemudu.
17 Khan Bahadur Javad Hussain Khan Sahib Bahadur.	37 Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
18 Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu.	38 Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
19 " P. K. Ramachandra Padayachi.	
20 Rao Bahadur D. Krishnamurti.	

Noes.

1 Diwan Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.	9 Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmiopathi.
2 Mr. M. Devadasan.	10 Mr. P. Ratnavelu Thevar.
3 Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.	11 " H. B. Ari Gowder.
4 Mr. V. T. Arasu.	12 Rao Bahadur R. K. Venugopal Nayudu.
5 " K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.	13 Mr. G. R. Premayya.
6 " K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.	14 " K. Koti Reddi.
7 " U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.	15 " P. V. Krishnayya Choudari.
8 " C. Ramalinga Reddi.	16 " K. Kesavaramamurti Nayudu.

[4th November 1935]

Neutral.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu. | 10 Mr. P. V. Rajagopala Pillai. |
| 2 „ Rao Bahadur A. T. Pan- | 11 „ F. J. Stanes. |
| nirselvam. | 12 The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 3 „ Mr. C. A. Souter. | 13 „ Bodinayakkanur. |
| 4 „ Mr. G. T. H. Bracken. | 14 Dr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 5 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma. | 15 Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 6 Mr. W. Scott Brown. | 16 Rao Bahadur P. C. Muthu Chetti- |
| 7 „ H. R. Uzielli. | yar. |
| 8 „ C. E. Jones. | 17 Mr. K. Ahmed Meeran Sahib. |
| 9 „ G. T. Boag. | 18 „ A. P. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai. |
| | 19 „ C. Basu Dev. |

Ayes 38. Noes 16. Neutral 19.

The motion was carried.

* Mrs. A. RUKMANI LAKSHMIPATHI:—“ Sir, I move—

‘ *In sub-section (1), delete sub-clauses (d), (e) and (f).* ’ ”

“ According to the amending Bill the Anglo-Indian Association is entitled to elect a representative to the Corporation. I do not mind accepting the amendment as suggested in the amending Bill if their representative were elected at least by ‘ Anglo-Indians.’ But even that I would not accept it being against the very principle underlying the amendment, I had given notice of to the effect that the Anglo-Indians should return a member under the system of joint electorate. The Anglo-Indian Association being a very small body, much smaller than the Anglo-Indian community, that Association as such could not possibly be given a representative of its own. I am not sure whether the Anglo-Indian Association represents the entire Anglo-Indian population of the City.

3-45 P.m. “ In view of the fact that I wish the Anglo-Indians to associate themselves with the general public of the City I move that the amendment be accepted, viz., that the Anglo-Indian Association should not be given separate representation.

“ Regarding sub-section (1) (e) of section 5 ‘ one Councillor elected by the Trustees of the Port of Madras ’ I see no reason why the trustees of the Port of Madras should be given separate representation, because they have no special interests to be safeguarded by their own special representative. I am against the very idea of associations like the Anglo-Indian Association, having separate representation. The same argument advanced by me against various interests or associations electing their special representatives should be discountenanced on principle. Sub-section 5 (f) which reads thus:—That ‘ one Councillor appointed by the South Indian Railway and the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Companies ’ is retrograde and undemocratic.

4th November 1935] [Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi]

“ With these few words I move for the deletion of sub-clauses (d), (e) and (f) of sub-section (1) of section 5, because I do not think that in the interests of the general public we would be right in giving separate representation to these bodies. They can come in through the general electorates.”

The amendment was duly seconded.

* Sir WILLIAM WRIGHT:—“ It is my unfortunate fate that I should appear in this House as an ungallant Member. Whenever the hon. the Lady Member speaks then I have to get up and oppose her. Now, Sir, as regards sub-clause (d), ‘one Councillor elected by the Anglo-Indian Association of Madras,’ I must say that I am in sympathy with the views of the hon. the Lady Member that the Councillor should be elected by the Anglo-Indians and not by the Anglo-Indian Association. But I understand that there is some difficulty in forming an electorate of the Anglo-Indians and so, if they are to have representation, it seems necessary that their Member should be elected by the Anglo-Indian Association. There is no Member here who can speak for the Anglo-Indian community and I am taking up cudgels on their behalf because I do not think there is anybody here who will take up their cause. The Anglo-Indian community have peculiar problems of their own in their daily life in this City, and I think it would be only fair to the community that they should have a direct representative of their own on the Council of the Corporation.

“ As regards sub-clauses (e) and (f) that one Councillor should be elected by the Trustees of the Port of Madras and another by the South Indian Railway and the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, I think the question of the Anglo-Indian Association having a representative of their own has no analogy whatever as suggested by the hon. Lady Member. In the one case you have got the Anglo-Indians as a community with peculiar problems of their own having a representative in the Madras Corporation for their own benefit. As regards the Port Trust and the Railways being represented in the Corporation, their representation is in the interests of the Corporation and the City itself. In recent years the word ‘safeguards’ has become unpopular, but in my opinion it is a safeguard and, in the interests of the Corporation, having a large port in its midst that there should be a representative of the Port Trust on the Council. In the City there must be constantly arising problems in connexion with the administration of that port and in its relation to the governing body of the City. When they are discussed both sides of the question should be presented to the Corporation in debate by people who really know what they are talking about and problems constantly do arise regarding the relations between the Port Trust and the City, and will no doubt constantly arise in the future. So it is very necessary and essential that in order to safeguard the interests of the Corporation they should have the benefit of advice from somebody who is directly connected with the Port Trust. All that

[Sir William Wright] [4th November 1935]

I have said above in regard to Port Trust equally applies to Railways. When you have two Railways serving the City there must be constantly questions arising between the executives of the Railways and the Corporation which governs the City. Therefore it is absolutely essential that in order to safeguard the interests of the Corporation and even the working of Corporation itself, that they should have the benefit of advice of the Members from the two Railways, such members being in a position to sit in the Corporation Council and speak with authority on all technical problems which may arise."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, We are not providing for any additional or new representation for the first time as it may appear from reading this Bill. In the old Act in section 5 (e) itself it is stated, 'three elected or appointed by such other associations or corporate bodies as the Governor in Council may by notification direct.' Under the old Act itself the Anglo-Indian Association, the Port Trust and the University have been given the privilege of sending three Members. Railways are always represented by nomination. So it is not desirable that we should deprive these interests of representation in future in the Corporation both in the interests of these bodies as well as the Corporation itself. I think such representation is necessary and therefore I oppose this amendment."

* Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Sir, I rise to endorse what Sir William Wright has stated in the cause of Anglo-Indians. Anglo-Indians have got certain privileges all this time and I do not think any reasonable man would say that the privilege that is now being enjoyed by the Association of Anglo-Indians should be taken away. Anglo-Indians, as Sir William Wright has pointed out, stand for distinct interests. So far as such matters are concerned and so long as I am going to stand for the interests which are specially peculiar to Muslims, I think it my duty that I should support the special interests of Anglo-Indian community? The hon. Lady Member for the City seems to think that some innovation has been made. That is not the case. I am deliberately opposed to any encroachment upon special interests of the minorities. I think, the Anglo-Indian community, having been clubbed together with Europeans, in many fields have suffered in the enjoyment of their rights. They also have given expression to the fact that they ought to have separate representation—and it is but a logical conclusion that they should have separate representation and separate electorates. So far as Corporation and municipalities are concerned, we are working on the general electorates basis. But only we have to reserve certain seats for certain communities alone. Government, by notification, has long ago fixed that these three bodies, viz., the Port Trust, the Railways and the Anglo-Indians may have separate representation. Now a representative of the Anglo-Indian community sits in the Corporation Council and I say he ought to continue to sit, and that right of the Anglo-Indians ought not to be taken away. I therefore strongly oppose the amendment."

The amendment was put and lost,

4th November 1935]

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Regarding the representation of the University of Madras, I do not see how it is proper or what is the object behind giving representation to the University on the Council of the Corporation."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I take it that he is not moving his amendment."

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I would like to say a few words. The Corporation does not run any college nor is it interested in questions connected with the University education and yet it is urged that the University must be given one seat on the Corporation out of the 65 seats. In so far as giving a seat to the University takes away the representation of general interests of workers I am opposed to it. In view of the fact, however, that the House has agreed to give separate representation to bodies of Indian Commerce whose strength, whose existence and whose history is a matter of considerable doubt, I do not think I should be justified in denying representation to the premier University of Madras on the Corporation whether there is any need for such representation or not."

The amendment (amendment No. 16 in the printed list) was not moved.

* Diwan Bahadur A. APPADURAI PILLAI:—"I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name which runs as follows:—

'Insert the following after sub-section (1) (g):—

"(g-1) one Councillor elected by the Indian Christian Association and one Councillor elected by the Madras City Catholic Association".

"Mr. President, Sir, the Indian Christian Association and the Madras City Catholic Association which are registered corporate bodies are intended for the moral, material and social progress of the community. These associations have been in existence for nearly 50 years and responsible members of the community have been the presidents. Diwan Bahadur Subramaniam, Dr. Sathianatham, Dr. Asirvatha Nadar and Dr. Palaniyandi, all very respectful members of the community have been Presidents of Indian Christian Association.

"Similarly the Madras City Catholic Association is a registered corporate body presided over by no less a person than His Grace the Archbishop of Madras. It has among its members respectable members of the community such as Mr. Ruthnaswami of the Madras Services Commission, the Hon. the Home Member who is in our midst not to make mention of several other members who have won the confidence and respect of Christians and non-Christians alike. The late Mr. Swamikannu Pillai was a member and so also Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. Under the existing Municipal Act, there was an opportunity for corporate bodies to seek representation on the Corporation of Madras. Clause (e) of section 5 provided for three members elected or appointed

[Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai] [4th November 1935]

by such other associations or corporate bodies as the Governor in Council may, by notification, direct. It has been the fortune of the Anglo-Indian Association to be declared by the Governor in Council as a corporate body fit to be represented on the Corporation. There was then an opportunity both for the Indian Christian Association and the Catholic Indian Association as corporate bodies to get representation on the Corporation. Unfortunately that section has been scrapped in the present Bill and in its place we find only the Anglo-Indian Association mentioned. No provision has been made for any other corporate body. The Indian Christian Association and the Catholic Indian Association have always been consulted whenever important political questions came up for consideration. It is within your knowledge how the Indian Christian Members of this House strenuously advocated the cause of Indian Christians in connexion with the delimitation of constituencies. In connexion with the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms also the Indian Christian community played a very prominent part. As has been admitted already on the floor of the House, by very responsible Members of the House, the Indian Christian Members have been known for their sound views and balance of judgment. Considering all these, it would be admittedly unfair, if I may use the word, to leave the Indian Christian Association and the Catholic Indian Association without any representation on the Corporation. I would therefore appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister and to this Hon. House to give an opportunity to the two associations that are operating in the City of Madras to be represented on the Corporation.

“ There is one misapprehension, Mr. President, which very often arises in connexion with Indian Christian representation. Whenever we get up and say that Indian Christian representation is inadequate, speakers one after another get up and say that there are influential members of the community who can fight their way in a general election, for instance, Sir Prakasam Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar and Mr. Ruthnaswami and so on. But all Indian Christians are not Mr. Ruthnaswami or Arogyaswami Mudaliyar or Appadurai Pillai. I speak on behalf of the Indian Christian masses, most of whom are people in low salaried employments and not in very good circumstances. A few members here and a few members there may be holding good positions and may be able to command the convenience and other things necessary to fight an election, but the majority of them are dependent. Unless some opportunity is given to them for fair representation in the Corporation and other local bodies along with other associations, I think the community will be dealt with very unfairly. The Anglo-Indian Association, I am glad to find, has been allowed to have a representative on the Corporation. I am entirely in favour of it. At the same time I would ask the House to show the same amount of charity and friendliness and extend the same concession to the Catholic Indian Association and the Indian Christian Association. If the Hon. Minister considers that I am asking for too much when I ask for two seats, I should be satisfied with a single seat for both the associations.

4th November 1935] [Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai]

The Hon. the Chief Minister on the last occasion when I moved an amendment was kind enough to promise that in case I was able to accept one seat he would be prepared to consider that request provided the other sections of the House did not object. I would appeal to him that if that promise is held out now, I would not press this motion and would rest content with one seat and explain to the members of the Catholic Indian Association and the Indian Christian Association that their rights have been adequately safeguarded. With these words I move the amendment standing in my name."

* Mr. G. R. PREMAYYA :—" Mr. President, Sir, I second the amendment. I endorse what has been said by my hon. Friend, Mr. Appadurai Pillai. I want to remind the Hon. the Chief Minister to keep the promise which he was gracious enough to make, namely, that he would reserve a division for the Christian seat, when the motion of my hon. Friend, Mr. Devadasan, was under consideration. Mr. Devadasan was very anxious to have more and he pressed his motion which was defeated. The Hon. the Chief Minister's promise continued. I think he will fulfil his promise. It is only to remind him of that that I second this motion."

* Mr. M. DEVADASAN :—" Mr. President, Sir, my hon. Friend stated that I was too anxious in the morning and did not accept the offer of the Hon. the Chief Minister. Sir, I did not reject the offer. The Hon. the Chief Minister was kind enough to say that he would have one seat reserved if all sections of the House agreed. At that moment I did not know whether all sections of the House would agree. Now it is open to the Hon. the Chief Minister to reconsider his offer. When every community in the City of Madras has been given adequate representation for the protection of its interests, I do not see why the Indian Christian community alone should be left in the lurch. Bare justice requires that there should be sufficient safeguard for the interest of the Madras Christians. I submit that this Act would not be complete and satisfactory unless adequate representation is given to the Indian Christian community."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" Sir, speaking on the previous amendment No. 11, I said it was not possible for the Government to accept any proposal which would involve an increase in the strength of the Council but that if there was a general agreement in the House I would certainly consider the question of the reservation of one division in rotation for returning an Indian Christian Councillor of the Corporation. Unfortunately at that time my proposal was not accepted. I do not say my proposal was rejected. At least I can say that it was not accepted and the amendment withdrawn. I am afraid my Indian Christian friends have lost the opportunity then offered. As far as I am concerned my undertaking still holds good. I am afraid without increasing the total strength of the Council it will not be possible to give one seat to this Association. At this stage it is too late. I find a difficulty to give effect to my proposal made in the morning. I am afraid that opportunity has

[The Raja of Bobbili] [4th November 1935]

now been lost and I do not see how this amendment can be accepted without increasing the total strength of the Council to which Government have objection."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" May I suggest that the matter may be deferred till to-morrow so that we might consider what the Hon. Chief Minister meant when he made the proposal this morning and find out what the attitude of the other sections of the House will be? "

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" My proposal was not accepted and the House has voted down the previous amendment. I do not see how it is open for us to go back. What I suggested was that one particular division might be earmarked for an Indian Christian representative if all the sections of the House agreed to it. But that was not accepted and the Council has passed the relevant clause. Even if we are to defer the matter for to-morrow or the day after, I do not see any way in which we can give effect to the original proposal of mine at this stage. Of course, I should like to know whether Leaders of other parties would like to have this matter deferred."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—" Sir, personally I do not see why when seats have not been reserved for the Muslim community and for women, the Indian Christian community which is better educated than either the Muslims or the women, should be treated differentially. I rather feel that since the mystic number of 65 cannot be increased, I should not be in favour of one of the 40 divisions being earmarked for any single community. If the Hon. Minister is willing to increase the mystic number 65 to 70 or even 68, I would be willing to allot two seats for women and one for Indian Christians. As long as he does not increase the number, I do not see how we can get over the difficulty."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—" Sir, I do not want to oppose the desire of Mr. Appadurai Pillai that Indian Christians should be properly represented. I also feel that without increasing the total number it will be impossible to accede to his request. Sir, when the delimitation proposals were discussed on the floor of this House we heard a great deal about the desire of the Indian Christian community to merge themselves in the general electorate. How can they now turn round and ask for special representatives elected by associations of their own? It seems to me quite illogical. I appeal to the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment."

4.15 P.m. Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—" Sir, I would like to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the two previous speakers. I do not think the case for this amendment is really strong. Indian Christians are most advanced in culture and education; they have played a prominent part in the public life of the country and why should they not take their chance in the joint electorate which has never shown any reluctance to support proper candidates from the Indian Christian community? I am unable to understand their turning round and asking for special representation at this stage after the lofty sentiments

4th November 1935] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

they expressed recently in connexion with the franchise and delimitation proposals under the new constitution. It seems to be lowering of their old demand. Again I cannot approve of the idea that a certain division should be earmarked for returning a member of a particular community. It seems to me that the electors should have full freedom to elect whomsoever they like unfettered in this manner. I therefore suggest that the Hon. the Chief Minister would do well to refuse to accept this amendment and any other proposals made with a view to getting that amendment effected in some way or other."

* Diwan Bahadur A. APPADURAI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am very sorry to see the cold reception given to this amendment of mine. I for one, generally hesitate to bring forward such amendments. Inasmuch as similar provision has been made in the Bill in the case of some communities and as similar concessions had not been made in respect of my community, I thought I might bring forward this amendment asking that the two associations referred to might be given the privilege of electing one member each. I was prepared to accept the suggestion made by the Hon. the Chief Minister this morning to set apart at least one division out of 45 divisions of the Corporation for an Indian Christian candidate. Now even that small concession or little mercy is not to be shown to the Indian Christian community. I take it as the fair indication of the sort of sympathy that the Indian Christians can expect from the majority community."

The amendment was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai Pillai. | 6 Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar. |
| 2 Mr. M. Devadasan. | 7 " M. S. Sreshta. |
| 3 Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj. | 8 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 4 Mr. P. C. Moses. | 9 Mr. C. Basu Dev. |
| 5 " G. F. F. Foulkes. | 10 " G. R. Premayya. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1 The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu. | 18 Mr. W. K. M. Langlay. |
| 2 " Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam. | 19 The Zamindar of Kirlampudi. |
| 3 " Mr. C. A. Souter. | 20 Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi. |
| 4 " " G. T. H. Bracken. | 21 " J. M. Smith. |
| 5 " " P. T. Rajan. | 22 " F. J. Stanes. |
| 6 " the Raja of Bobbili. | 23 Khan Bahadur Javad Hussain Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7 Mr. W. Scott Brown. | 24 Mr. P. K. Ramachandra Padayachi. |
| 8 " H. R. Uzielli. | 25 Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai |
| 9 " C. E. Jones. | 26 Rao Bahadur D. Krishnamurti. |
| 10 " G. T. Boag. | 27 Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo. |
| 11 " R. Madanagopal Nayudu. | 28 Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schmnad Sahib Bahadur. |
| 12 " T. B. Russell. | 29 Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 13 " T. Sundara Rao Nayudu. | 30 Mr. G. Sriramulu. |
| 14 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. | 31 " J. Kuppuswami Choudari. |
| 15 Mr. G. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 32 " C. Indrayya. |
| 16 Sir William Wright. | 33 " R. Pattabhiramayya. |
| 17 Mr. D. M. Reid. | 34 " S. A. A. Annamalai Chettiyar. |

[4th November 1935]

Noes—cont.

35 Rao Sahib D. V. Narasimhaswami.	41 Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
36 Mr. K. Kesavaramamurti Nayudu.	42 Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi.
37 Dr. P. Subbarayan.	43 Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi.
38 Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.	44 Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
39 Rao Bahadur P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.	45 The Zamindar of Chemudu.
40 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.	46 Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari.
	47 Mahaboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.

Ayes 10. Noes 47.

The motion was lost.

Clause 5—Section 6.

* Mr. D. M. REID:—"Sir, this amendment^a is consequential on amendment No. 199 which says 'delete rule 14 added by the Select Committee, etc.' I am quite ready, Sir, to move the present amendment to this extremely important clause of the Bill or if you think that it would be better if I do so when we come to amendment No. 199 which deals with the whole point, I shall do so. It seems to me that if we pass this first amendment, the whole of the other amendments 199, 200, 203 and 204 will have to follow. I will do as you wish."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"If the House feels that the discussion of these two amendments 20 and 20-A should be taken up along with the other amendments, No. 199 and those following, I have absolutely no objection. Clause 5 will have to be held over until the other clause is considered."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Sir, as my hon. Friend, Mr. Reid, pointed out, the amendments go together. The substantive amendment is amendment No. 199 to clause 220. I therefore feel that it would be better if all these amendments are taken together."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I have no objection to the course suggested."

Discussion on amendments 20 and 20-A in the printed list was postponed.

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

'For section 7 substitute the following:—

"7. The Corporation shall appoint a person to be Commissioner from among the District Collectors subject to the approval of the Local Self-Government Department and the Commissioner shall not be a member of the Council".'

The reason for moving this amendment is that the Corporation should be given the power and privilege of selecting its Commissioner, instead of the Government thrusting the officer they like on the Corporation. If the Government would supply the Corporation the list of District Collectors who are eligible to be appointed as commissioners, and the Corporation is given the option of choosing one of those

^a Delete the words 'excluding taxation appeals.'

4th November 1935] [Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari]

officers, then it will be possible for the Corporation and the officer whom they select to work amicably. Such an arrangement would be more convenient and will be in the interest of better administration. I do not propose that like the Calcutta Corporation, the Madras Corporation should appoint its own officer. I only say that the Corporation should select the officer and the selection has to be approved by the Government. In that case the choice will be of the Corporation and not of the Government. In the interest of better understanding between the Corporation and the Commissioner, I request the Hon. Minister to accept this amendment."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Sir, I wish to point out that this amendment may be taken after amendment 22-A which covers a larger ground. If we know the voting on amendment No. 22-A, we can easily take up this amendment."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Both the amendments may be taken up and discussed and put to vote."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"Sir, I moved such an amendment in the Select Committee. It was not carried. I have brought forward this amendment as a sort of compromise. Dr. Subbarayan's amendment is wider in scope and if the House is prepared to accept his amendment I have no objection. With these words I move my amendment."

Mr. G. R. PREMAYYA:—"I second it."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Mr. President, I move that for section 7 of the Act, the following section shall be substituted:—

4-30
p.m.

'7. The Commissioner shall be appointed by the Corporation from out of a panel recommended by the Madras Services Commission.'

I do not think, Sir, any words are needed from me to commend this amendment to the hon. Members of this House; because I do feel that when Corporations such as the Calcutta Corporation have got the right to appoint their own Chief Executive Officers, the Madras Corporation which is the premier Corporation in this province should have the same right. I know it has been said that it will lead to political influences if the Corporation gets the right to appoint whomsoever it likes. That is the reason why I suggest this amendment. There is already a satisfactory machinery in the hands of the Government of Madras, namely, the Madras Public Services Commission through which they can get a panel, and one of the candidates in the panel recommended by the Commission can be appointed by the Corporation. That will mean that the Government do not interfere with the Corporation in this appointment of the Chief Executive Officer. The Corporation will not really be carried away by political considerations either; on the other hand, it will be able to strengthen the hands of the Public Services Commission in the matter of the selection of the

[Dr. P. Subbarayan] [4th November 1935]

officer. For, once the names of a few candidates are approved by the Commission, the Corporation will have only to choose one from among them."

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I second it."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"With your leave, Sir, I desire to move an amendment to the amendment of Dr. Subbarayan, i.e., to delete the words 'from out of a panel recommended by the Madras Services Commission.' It is an amendment to an amendment."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It may be an amendment to an amendment, but it is going to cut it through."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I submit that the question of principle here is one that arises with regard to the power of the Corporation to appoint the Commissioner. So far as that is concerned, Dr. Subbarayan's amendment and my amendment are the same; only, Dr. Subbarayan's amendment restricts the scope of the appointment. The original section says that the Government should appoint; Mr. Krishnayya Choudari's amendment is that the Corporation should appoint from a list of Collectors; Dr. P. Subbarayan's amendment is—and he also agrees with Mr. Choudari—that the Corporation should appoint, but restricts the scope and says that the appointment should be made out of a panel. The question of the appointing authority is therefore involved in all these cases. I simply restrict the power, by my amendment, to the Corporation itself. I therefore submit that on the question of principle, there is no conflict between my amendment and Dr. Subbarayan's amendment."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am not in entire agreement with the hon. Member; but anyhow, I have no objection to allow him to move his amendment."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I am obliged to you, Sir. My amendment is to delete the words 'from out of a panel recommended by the Madras Services Commission' from the amendment of Dr. Subbarayan. The amendment will then read: 'The Commissioner shall be appointed by the Corporation.' No doubt there is great difference between this amendment and the section as drafted; because, according to section 7, the Commissioner shall be appointed by the local Government, while my amendment seeks to have that power vested in the Corporation. I wish this question had received greater attention from the Select Committee than it has done. So far as the Madras Corporation is concerned, we do feel that the Corporation should have the power of appointment even as regards the Commissioner. In Corporations like the Calcutta Corporation, the power of appointing the executive officers vests in the Corporation. If you are anxious that local self-government should develop in this province, the premier Corporation of the province at least should have, just like the Corporations of Bombay and Calcutta, the power to appoint its own Commissioner. The Corporation has now the power of appointing the other officers; in regard to the Commissioner's appointment alone

4th November 1935] [Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar]

the practice has been for the Government to appoint him. I do not see any reason why the Madras Corporation should not be entrusted with the duty of choosing its Chief Executive Officer. After all, there are certain regulations governing such appointments; it is not as if the Corporation is going to appoint any one who is not fit to hold that post. The qualifications for the Commissioner's post will certainly be laid down in the regulations and it need not be presumed that the Corporation will, in all cases, try to appoint somebody who will not be fit. If only this House looks into the proceedings of the Corporation, it will be found that in very many cases of appointment, such as the Health Officer, the Revenue Officer, etc., the Corporation has very often selected Government servants. It need not be thought that the Corporation would try to bring in a non-official or otherwise abuse the patronage vested in it. The premier Corporation of the province should certainly be expected to exercise this patronage very carefully. If necessary, the Government may even have the power of veto. When there has been no abuse of such power in the past in regard to other appointments, why should not the power be extended to the appointment of the Commissioner also? It is said that the future Government of the province will be a popular one responsible to the people and therefore one can trust such a Government to make the best choice. I am not now saying that the Government of Madras cannot make a proper selection. I am only pleading for the right of the Corporation which is supposed to be an autonomous body. An employer who pays his employee should certainly have the power of selecting his employee; it is the wearer that knows where the shoe pinches. The Corporation should be able to find out who will be the best officer and which kind of officer will be useful to it. At one time an officer with experience of revenue matters may be necessary; at another time, an officer with other qualifications may be necessary—that is a matter which will have to be judged by the circumstances at the time of appointment. I therefore feel strongly that the Corporation should be given this power.

“With regard to the point that the Local Government may be entrusted with the duty of making a good choice, though, as I said, I do not say that the Government will not make a good selection, I do not see why they should have all such power concentrated in themselves. For instance, they have this power not only with regard to the Corporation but with regard to the local bodies. Why not give away some of these powers to the local bodies and be only a revising authority? Where power is abused or not exercised properly let the Government interfere. I do not think it is fair that the Government should interfere with the day to day administration of local bodies. I therefore plead, Sir, that the Corporation should be entrusted with the power of appointing its Chief Executive Officer.”

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—“I second it.”

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“May I mention a word? I find that in drafting the amendment, the words ‘and shall not be a member of the

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[4th November 1935]

Council ' have been left out. They should be added on to my amendment. It was not my intention, at the time of drafting, that the Commissioner should be a member of the Madras Corporation Council. I therefore propose, Sir, that those words may now be added to my amendment."

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—" I second it."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Dr. Subbarayan further amends his amendment, by which the words ' and shall not be a member of the Council ' are added at the end."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—" It follows, Sir, that my amendment also will have those words added on to it. I therefore suggest that those words may be added on to my amendment also."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I presume that the hon. Member agrees to Dr. Subbarayan's later amendment."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—" Yes."

* Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—" Mr. President, Sir, the question of the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer to municipal bodies has been engaging the attention of this House on various occasions, especially after a Bill was introduced by my hon. Friend, Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, with reference to mufassal municipalities. In that connexion, the question of the appointment of the Commissioner of the Madras Corporation was also discussed in this House. I want to draw a distinction between the Executive Officer of the Corporation and the executive officers of mufassal municipalities. I am one of those who still feel that the appointment of Commissioners may not be necessary for certain mufassal municipalities. But the Madras Corporation stands on a different footing. Before the year 1920 the Corporation had an official President, practically akin to the present Commissioner of the Corporation and this was also the case in Calcutta and Bombay at that time. When later they amended the Calcutta Act, the Corporation was allowed to choose its own Commissioner.

" Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar referred to the appointment of certain senior officers by the Corporation itself on a salary of Rs. 500 or so who are all below the Commissioner, such as the Health Officer, the Educational Officer, the Electrical Engineer, the Engineer for Special Works, the Revenue Officer, etc., about half a dozen at the most. Sir, I have witnessed the elections to these posts by the Council, resulting in the appointment of certain officers. We must however draw a clear line of distinction between the appointment of these officers and that of the Commissioner. The Commissioner is one who is there for only a period of three years, and he is one about whom the Councillors of the Corporation have no idea—as to who he is, what his abilities are, etc. I venture to suggest therefore that the Councillors of the Corporation are not in a fit position to discuss the merits and abilities of any of the three names that may be submitted by the

4th November 1935] [Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar]

Services Commission. With reference to the various other officers of the Corporation, no doubt, the question is not the same; for, a Revenue Officer or a Health Officer or an Engineer is generally a person who has already served the Corporation for say fifteen years or more, and is known to practically all the councillors, having risen from the lower ranks; for example, the Assistant Engineer works his way up to the post of Engineer. The Corporation knows the abilities of such people and it will therefore be easy for the Corporation in such cases, to choose the officer. Even there, we have had occasions when canvassing prevailed; but still, the Council was in a position to exercise its discretion and find out who the best man was.

“ Then, Sir, with regard to the power of appointment of the Chief Executive Officer, I say that it should be kept away from the Corporation Council. Under the City Municipal Act, there are three distinct authorities, the Commissioner, the Standing Committees and the Council, and the powers of these three authorities have been delimited in the Act, and if there should be no friction at all, the position of the Commissioner also should be made distinct and clear. For the sake of argument, I will take the case where the Services Commission give three names, say, A, B and C. The Council knows nothing about the three persons who are District Collectors. It would be unfair to the three gentlemen, who probably may not have thought about this appointment at all—though of course it may be put in the City Council Act that the Services Commission may select three names out of the 25 District Collectors,—if the City Corporation were to discuss the merits and demerits of these persons. And if it should happen that one of the candidates recommended by the Services Commission is a Muslim, another an Indian Christian and the third a member of the depressed classes, it will be very interesting to witness the election of this officer in the City Council. I have no doubt, on that occasion the various representatives of the different communities will pull their strings in favour of the representative of their community. So, it will lead to all sorts of complications. If supposing A is elected by a majority of the members and the person appointed is to function for three years, human nature as we know being what it is, it is difficult to expect the Councillors not to pester their representative with requests. It is therefore essential that the appointment of the Commissioner should be kept away from the Council of the Corporation. One thing I am prepared to say and that is, if the Councillors of the Corporation have no confidence in the Ministry to appoint the Commissioner, I would suggest that such appointment of the senior officer of the Corporation be given to the Services Commission who will select a person to be the Commissioner of the Corporation. I think that will be better in the circumstances. Then the question of voting in the Council will be avoided. For these reasons I feel that the question of appointment of the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation must be kept as far away from the Council as possible. Moreover, Sir, the person appointed has to manage a very big staff and it is essential that the person who is appointed to the post should come

4-45
p.m.

[Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar] [4th November 1935]

there without any prejudice or obligation to the Members of the Council. I hope the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition and my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar, who know the affairs of the Corporation, will appreciate this point and will be convinced of my suggestion; and if they agree with this, I appeal to them to withdraw their amendment."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am sceptical about giving the Council of the City Corporation a hand in the appointment of the Commissioner. One is not unaware of the fact that in the matter of the superior appointments, barring the Commissioner, very much canvassing does take place. I believe it is within the experience of the Councillors of the Corporation that they are very often pestered by the candidates themselves or by persons interested in the candidates in respect of the appointments. When such is the case, how much more difficult would it be if they should be pestered again in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner, which is the highest appointment in the whole service of the Corporation.

"Then, again, Sir, I cannot see eye to eye with Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar, with reference to the position that the Commissioner takes and the position taken by various other Government appointments. Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar asks, why should not the Corporation be given the power to appoint the Commissioner, because practically the Corporation is the employer and the Commissioner is the employee.

"Now, so far as the Government is concerned, the Madras Government which is going to function after the Reforms come into existence, what is the justification for the existence of the Public Services Commission? Can we visualize the Legislative Council making the appointments? Viewing the question from the standpoint taken by Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar, if the Corporation can appoint the Commissioner, why not the Legislative Council make all the appointments under the Madras Government? We shall just visualize such a situation. You can see the absurdity of the position taken, because it is impossible for the Legislative Council consisting of so many diverse interests to make it a point to choose particular men fitted for any particular post. We have instituted what is known as the Public Services Commission which finds statutory recognition under the Government of India Act. 'In order to avoid this trouble and the responsibility of making the appointments, such an institution is recognized by Statute. Similarly, therefore, I should have thought that the Corporation would be anxious to get rid of this responsibility of making these appointments. First of all, there is the absolutely demoralizing effect of canvassing that is sure to go on. I can visualize the possibility of persons occupying responsible posts of District Collectors and persons of corresponding status, going about from house to house of the Councillors of the Corporation and canvassing particularly for their votes in order to get the appointment. That certainly can be avoided if the Public Services Commission is to make the selection and recommend the appointment to the Corporation.

4th November 1935] [Mr. K. P. Raman Menon]

Sir, the amendments proposed by Mr. Krishnayya Choudari, Dr. Subbarayan and Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar come to the same thing so far as this matter is concerned. They all recommend that the power of appointment should be in the Corporation of Madras. First of all, 'is that desirable' is the question that has to be decided. Then, 'is it desirable that a restriction ought to be placed upon the Corporation in making the choice', is the next question to be decided. I, for one, am not for thinking that the appointment should be made by the Corporation at all, but that it should be made by somebody else—a totally different individual. If, as a matter of fact, the coming Government is going to be a democratic Government, why should you not have confidence in the Ministers and in the Public Services Commission to make these appointments, and why should you not have confidence in those persons to select a person who will be fit in all ways to fill the responsible post of the Commissioner of the Corporation? I would rather trust the Government for the time being. We need not think in terms of the present-day Government, an alien Government which is in power and the popular side in the opposition, but you should think of a popular Government sitting here and agreeing with your views. As a matter of fact, when the new constitution functions, it will be a responsible Government, responsible to the Legislature and responsible to the public. Why not trust them with the proper machinery, the Public Services Commission, to make the appointment? I would, therefore, earnestly request the hon. Gentlemen who have moved the amendments to withdraw them and to leave it to the Government to choose the best candidate that they would think fit."

* The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, now there are three separate amendments under discussion. The first proposes that the Corporation should appoint a person to be the Commissioner from among the District Collectors subject to the approval of the Local Self-Government Department and that the Commissioner shall not be a Member of the Council. The second amendment means in effect that the Commissioner should be appointed by the Corporation out of a panel recommended by the Services Commission. My hon. Friend, Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar, has moved an amendment to the above amendment to the effect that the Corporation itself should appoint its Chief Executive Officer. In support of these amendments, various grounds have been advanced and I should particularly refer to a few of them. It has been stated that the Calcutta Corporation exercises such powers and therefore a premier Corporation like Madras should have similar powers. Now, Sir, the exercise of this power in Calcutta has, in some instances, as hon. Members are aware, led to unhappy results. We need not follow that analogy here. Of course, the real difficulty in entrusting the power of appointment to such an important post in the hands of an elective body is that there is bound to be a number of competitors for this post and it is not desirable that Government servants should be induced or encouraged to go and canvass for the votes of Councillors for election as the Commissioner. Apart from that, in view of the coming constitutional changes,

[The Raja of Bobbili] [4th November 1935]

I think, it is necessary and desirable that we should revise our views about the autonomy of local boards and Local Self-Government. I do not see any inconsistency or anything undemocratic in having an autonomous Government at the top exercising some sort of ultimate control over local bodies. Any person with sufficient administrative experience would realize that it is most dangerous and inadvisable to create independent bodies with full autonomous powers which are not subject to the ultimate control of the Local Government. Now that we are likely in a very short time to have a Ministry fully responsible to the Legislature, I do not see why we should consider that the future Government would be unwilling or unable to discharge its responsibilities and would not select the best men for these appointments. In the matter of these appointments, I would submit that the Local Government alone will be competent to judge the capacity or suitability of particular individuals for these posts and neither the Services Commission nor the Corporation who have no experience of the work of these individuals will be the best judges for selecting the most suitable candidate for the post.

“As regards the amendment of Dr. Subbarayan, there is another difficulty. According to the Services Commission Act, they will have to deal only with appointments to Government service and I am afraid, it will be outside the scope of the Public Services Commission Act to saddle them with further responsibilities in making the selection to the post of Commissioner of the Corporation.

“Then, again, Sir, as regards the other minor appointments in the Corporation, we find that the appointments are made subject to the approval of the Local Government.”

5 p.m. “Moreover, all these amendments have not even provided for any such safeguard and the most important appointment in the Corporation is proposed to be made without even the approval of the Government. In answer to the point raised by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar, that the Corporation must have a free right in the choice of the Commissioner, I, for one, am not prepared to treat the Government and the Corporation as two conflicting elements or independent bodies as far as public interests are concerned. When Government are giving large grants and loans to the Corporation every year from the public funds, they must have some say in the choice of the Executive Officer and see that every possible care is taken to discharge the executive functions of the Corporation efficiently. By my opposition to these amendments, it should not be understood that it is due to any distrust of the Corporation; but it is conceived in the best interests of the Corporation itself that the appointment of the Commissioner should be taken out of the influence of the Councillors of the Corporation of Madras.”

Further discussion was postponed till the 6th November 1935.